arXiv:1508.07548v2 [math.SG] 31 Jul 2016

Hamilton-Jacobi Theorems for Nonholonomic Reducible Hamiltonian Systems on a Cotangent Bundle

Manuel de León
Instituto de Ciencias Matemáticas ,
Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas ,
c/Nicolás Cabrera 13-15, 28049 Madrid, Spain.
E-mail: mdeleon@icmat.es

Hong Wang [*]
School of Mathematical Sciences and LPMC,
Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, P.R.China
E-mail: hongwang@nankai.edu.cn

August 1, 2016

Abstract: Hamilton-Jacobi theorem reveals the deeply internal relationship between the generating function and the dynamical vector field of a Hamiltonian system. Because of the restriction given by constraints, in general, the dynamical vector field of nonholonomic Hamiltonian system is not Hamiltonian, however, it can be described by the dynamical vector field of a distributional Hamiltonian system. In this paper, we give two types of Hamilton-Jacobi equation for a distributional Hamiltonian system, by the calculation in detail. Moreover, we generalize the above results to nonholonomic reducible Hamiltonian system with symmetry, as well as with momentum map, and obtain two types of Hamilton-Jacobi equations for the nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian systems. As an application, we give two examples to illustrate the theoretical results.

Keywords: Hamilton-Jacobi theorem, nonholonomic Hamiltonian system, distributional Hamiltonian system, nonholonomic reduction, momentum map.

AMS Classification: 70H20, 70F25, 53D20.

Contents

1 Introduction 2

2 Dynamics of Nonholonomic Mechanical System 3

3 Hamilton-Jacobi Theorem for a Distributional Hamiltonian System 7

4 Hamilton-Jacobi Theorem for a Reduced Distributional Hamiltonian System 12

---

[*] Corresponding author Hong Wang (E-mail: hongwang@nankai.edu.cn).

5 Nonholonomic Hamiltonian System with Symmetry and Momentum Map 18

6 Applications 25
6.1 The constrained particle in $\mathbb{R}^3$ 25
6.2 The vertical rolling disk 30

1 Introduction

As it is well-known, the Hamilton-Jacobi theory is an important part of classical mechanics. Indeed, Hamilton-Jacobi equation provides a characterization of the generating functions of certain time-dependent canonical transformations, such that a given Hamiltonian system can be converted in an equivalent one, in such a form that its solutions are extremely easy to find (this is the so-called method by reduction to the equilibrium, see Abraham and Marsden [1], Arnold [2], Libermann and Marle [26], and Marsden and Ratiu [30]). In addition, it is possible in many cases that Hamilton-Jacobi equation provides an immediate way to integrate the equation of motion of system, even when the problem of Hamiltonian system itself has not been or cannot be solved completely. Moreover, the Hamilton-Jacobi equation is also fundamental in the study of the quantum-classical relationship in quantization, and it also plays an important role in the development of numerical integrators that preserve the symplectic structure and in the study of stochastic dynamical systems, see Woodhouse [48], Ge and Marsden [13], Marsden and West [33] and Lázaro-Camí and Ortega [20]. For these reasons, it is described as a useful tools in the study of Hamiltonian system theory, and has been extensively developed in the past years, becoming one of the most active subjects in the study of modern applied mathematics and analytical mechanics. The geometric point of view has been discussed in Abraham and Marsden [1], and later exploited by many authors, see Cariñena et al. [8] and [9], Iglesias et al. [15], de León et al. [21,22], Vitagliano [41], for more details. Also, Wang in [43] proves a key lemma, inspired for the corresponding results of Abraham and Marsden in [1] that can be used to get some extensions of the Hamilton-Jacobi theory for more general settings, see Wang [43–46] for more details.

We have known that, in mechanics, it is very often that many systems have constraints. Usually, there are two types of constraints. The first one is holonomic, which is that imposed on the configuration space of a system; the second one is nonholonomic, which involves the conditions on the velocities of a system, such as rolling constraints. Thus, the nonholonomic mechanics describes the motion of systems constrained by nonintegrable constraints, i.e., constraints on the system velocities that do not arise from constraints on the configurations alone. Moreover, the reduction of nonholonomically constrained mechanical systems is very important subject in geometric mechanics, and it is also regarded as a useful tool for simplifying and studying concrete nonholonomic systems. Indeed, there are many interesting results obtained by many scholars: Koiller in a seminal paper [17] studied the nonholonomic reduction, when the Lie group is not Abelian; Bloch in [4] studied the reduction and control of nonholonomic systems; Bates and Śniatycki [3] and Cantrijn et al. [6,7] developed an almost symplectic reduction on the Hamiltonian side of nonholonomic systems, see also, Cushman et al. [11] and [12]; and Bloch et al. in [5] and de León et al. in [23] developed the reduction on the Lagrangian side; and de León et al. in [22,24] and Koon and Marsden in [18,19] developed Poisson reduction; and Koon and Marsden in [18] established the equivalent relations between the two sides of Hamiltonian and Lagrangian. There have been other important results, see Cantrijn et al. [6], Cendra et al. [10], Koon and Marsden in [19], Jotz and Ratiu [16], Śniatycki [38] and [39] and so on.

A natural problem is how to study the Hamilton-Jacobi theory in the presence of symmetries, even in the nonholonomic case. This is goal of our research in this paper. In particular, we note that, because of the restriction given by constraints, in general, the dynamical vector field of a nonholonomic Hamiltonian system may not be Hamiltonian, however it can be described by the dynamical vector field of a distributional Hamiltonian system. The distributional Hamiltonian system and its nonholonomic reduction have been introduced by Bates and Śniatycki in [3], also see Cushman et al. [11] and [12], and it is called the semi-Hamiltonian system in Patrick [36]. In this paper, we give the formulations of two types of Hamilton-Jacobi equations for a distributional Hamiltonian system and its reduced distributional Hamiltonian systems, respectively, by analyzing carefully the structures for the nonholonomic (reduced) dynamical vector fields and by the calculation in detail. It is worthy of note that, in general, the dynamical vector field of the nonholonomic Hamiltonian system may not be Hamiltonian, and the distributional Hamiltonian system and its nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian systems are not yet Hamiltonian systems, we can not describe the Hamilton-Jacobi equations for distributional Hamiltonian system and its reductions from the viewpoint of generating function as in the classical case.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we first recall the main facts about the dynamics of a nonholonomic Hamiltonian system, including the influence of symmetries, which are helpful for us to understand the constructions of a distributional Hamiltonian system and its nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system. In section 3, we give two types of Hamilton-Jacobi equation for a distributional Hamiltonian system, by the analysis and calculation in detail. The nonholonomic reducible Hamiltonian systems with symmetries, as well as momentum maps, are considered respectively in section 4 and section 5, and give two types of Hamilton-Jacobi equations for the nonholonomic reduced and the $\mathbf{J}$-nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian systems (in particular, when the Lie group is not Abelian). As the applications of the theoretical results, we consider the motions of the constrained particle in space $\mathbb{R}^3$ and the vertical rolling disk in section 6, and give various Hamilton-Jacobi equations for the distributional Hamiltonian systems and their reduced distributional Hamiltonian systems corresponding to the two nonholonomic systems. These research work develop the nonholonomic reduction and Hamilton-Jacobi theory of the nonholonomic Hamiltonian systems with symmetries and make us have much deeper understanding and recognition for the structures of the nonholonomic Hamiltonian systems.

2 Dynamics of Nonholonomic Mechanical System

In this section, we first review briefly some basic facts about nonholonomic mechanical systems and give the descriptions of dynamics of a nonholonomic Hamiltonian system and the nonholonomic Hamiltonian system with symmetry, which are helpful for us in subsequent sections to understand the constructions of distributional Hamiltonian system and nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system. We shall follow the notations and conventions introduced in Cantrijn et al. [7], Bates and Śniatycki in [3], Cushman et al. [11] and [12], Montgomery [34], de León et al. [23], Marsden et al. [31] and Wang [43].

In order to describe the dynamics of a nonholonomic mechanical system, we need some restriction conditions for nonholonomic constraints of the system. At first, we note that the set of Hamiltonian vector fields forms a Lie algebra with respect to the Lie bracket, since $X_{\{f,g\}} = -[X_f, X_g]$. But, the Lie bracket operator, in general case, may not be closed on the restriction of a nonholonomic constraint. Thus, we have to give the following completeness condition for nonholonomic constraints of a system.

$\mathcal{D}$-completeness Let Q be a smooth manifold and TQ its tangent bundle. A distribution $\mathcal{D} \subset TQ$ is said to be **completely nonholonomic** (or bracket-generating) if $\mathcal{D}$ along with all of its iterated Lie brackets $[\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}], [\mathcal{D}, [\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}]], \cdots$ spans the tangent bundle TQ. Moreover, we consider a mechanical system on Q. Then nonholonomic constraints of the system are said to be **completely nonholonomic** if the distribution $\mathcal{D} \subset TQ$ defined by the nonholonomic constraints is completely nonholonomic.

In this paper we consider that a nonholonomic mechanical system is given by a Lagrangian function $L : TQ \to \mathbb{R}$ subject to constraints determined by a completely nonholonomic distribution $\mathcal{D} \subset TQ$ on the configuration manifold Q. We denote by D the total space of $\mathcal{D}$ in TQ, which is a constraint submanifold. For simplicity we always assume that $\tau_Q(D) = Q$, where $\tau_Q : TQ \to Q$ is the canonical projection, that is, the constraints are purely kinematical in the sense that they do not impose restrictions on the allowable positions. The motions of the system are forced to take place on D and this requires the introduction of some "reaction force". In order to describe the constraint submanifold in the phase space and the dynamics of system, we have to give the following regularity condition.

$\mathcal{D}$-regularity In the following we always assume that Q is a smooth manifold with coordinates (q^i), and TQ its tangent bundle with coordinates $(q^i, \dot{q}^i)$, and T^*Q its cotangent bundle with coordinates (q^i, p_j), which are the canonical cotangent coordinates of T^*Q and $\omega = dq^i \wedge dp_i$ is canonical symplectic form on T^*Q. If the Lagrangian $L : TQ \to \mathbb{R}$ is hyperregular, that is, the Hessian matrix $(\partial^2 L/\partial \dot{q}^i \partial \dot{q}^j)$ is nondegenerate everywhere, then the Legendre transformation $FL : TQ \to T^*Q$ is a diffeomorphism. In this case the Hamiltonian $H : T^*Q \to \mathbb{R}$ is given by $H(q,p) = \dot{q} \cdot p - L(q, \dot{q})$ with Hamiltonian vector field X_H and $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{F}L(\mathcal{D})$ is a constraint submanifold in T^*Q. In particular, for the nonholonomic constraint $\mathcal{D}$, a Lagrangian L is said to be **$\mathcal{D}$-regular**, if the restriction of Hessian matrix $(\partial^2 L/\partial \dot{q}^i \partial \dot{q}^j)$ on $\mathcal{D}$ is nondegenerate everywhere. Moreover, a nonholonomic system is said to be **$\mathcal{D}$-regular**, if its Lagrangian L is **$\mathcal{D}$-regular**. Note that the restriction of a positive definite symmetric bilinear form to a subspace is also positive definite, and hence nondegenerate. Thus, for a simple nonholonomic mechanical system, that is, whose Lagrangian is the total kinetic energy minus potential energy, it is **$\mathcal{D}$-regular** automatically, which is coincident with the sense of regularity of nonholonomic system given by de Léon and Martín de Diego [23].

In the following we shall describe the dynamics of the nonholonomic Hamiltonian system $(T^*Q, \omega, \mathcal{D}, H)$. We define the distribution $\mathcal{F}$ as the pre-image of the nonholonomic constraints $\mathcal{D}$ for the map $T\pi_Q : TT^*Q \to TQ$, that is, $\mathcal{F} = (T\pi_Q)^{-1}(\mathcal{D}) \subset TT^*Q$, which is a distribution along $\mathcal{M}$, and $\mathcal{F}^\circ := \{\alpha \in T^*T^*Q | < \alpha, v >= 0, \ \forall v \in TT^*Q\}$ is the annihilator of $\mathcal{F}$ in $T^*T^*Q_{|\mathcal{M}}$. We consider the following nonholonomic constraints condition

$$(\mathbf{i}_X \omega - \mathbf{d}H) \in \mathcal{F}^\circ, \qquad X \in T\mathcal{M}, \tag{2.1}$$

from Cantrijn et al. [7], we know that there exists an unique nonholonomic vector field X_n satisfying the above condition (2.1), if the admissibility condition $\dim\mathcal{M} = \operatorname{rank}\mathcal{F}$ and the compatibility condition $T\mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{F}^\perp = \{0\}$ hold, where $\mathcal{F}^\perp$ denotes the symplectic orthogonal of $\mathcal{F}$ with respect to the canonical symplectic form ω. In particular, when we consider the Whitney sum decomposition $T(T^*Q)_{|\mathcal{M}} = T\mathcal{M} \oplus \mathcal{F}^\perp$ and the canonical projection $P : T(T^*Q)_{|\mathcal{M}} \to T\mathcal{M}$, we have that $X_n = P(X_H)$.

If the Lagrangian $L : TQ \to \mathbb{R}$ is singular, in this case the Hessian matrix $(\partial^2 L/\partial\dot{q}^i\partial\dot{q}^j)$ is degenerate. By using the Gotay-Nester presymplectic constraint algorithm, see [14], we can find a final constraint submanifold $\mathcal{M}_f \subset T^*Q$, such that on which there exists a nonholonomic vector field X_n satisfying the following nonholonomic constraints condition

$$(\mathbf{i}_X\omega - \mathbf{d}H)_{|\mathcal{M}_f} \in \mathcal{F}^\circ, \qquad X_{|\mathcal{M}_f} \in T\mathcal{M}_f. \tag{2.2}$$

Therefore, without loss of generality, we shall henceforth always assume that there exists a nonholonomic vector field X_n satisfying the nonholonomic constraints condition.

From the condition (2.1) we know that the nonholonomic vector field, in general case, may not be Hamiltonian, because of the restriction of nonholonomic constraints. But, we hope to study the dynamical vector field of nonholonomic Hamiltonian system by using the similar method of studying Hamiltonian vector field. On the other hand, we also note that Bates and Śniatycki in [3] give a method to study the nonholonomic Hamiltonian system and nonholonomic reduction. In fact, for a nonholonomic Hamiltonian system $(T^*Q, \omega, \mathcal{D}, H)$, by using their method, we know that there exist a distribution $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{F} \cap T\mathcal{M}$, a non-degenerate distributional two-form $\omega_\mathcal{K}$ and a vector field $X_\mathcal{K}$ on the constraint submanifold $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{F}L(\mathcal{D}) \subset T^*Q$, such that the distributional Hamiltonian equation $\mathbf{i}_{X_\mathcal{K}}\omega_\mathcal{K} = \mathbf{d}H_\mathcal{K}$ holds, then the triple $(\mathcal{K}, \omega_\mathcal{K}, H)$ is a distributional Hamiltonian system, and $X_\mathcal{K}$ is a nonholonomic vector field.

Moreover, we consider the nonholonomic Hamiltonian system with symmetry and nonholonomic reduction. Assume that Lie group G acts smoothly by the left on Q, its tangent lifted acts on TQ and its cotangent lifted acts on T^*Q, which is free, proper and symplectic. The orbit space T^*Q/G is a smooth manifold and the canonical projection $\pi_{/G} : T^*Q \to T^*Q/G$ is a surjective submersion. In the following we shall describe the dynamics of the nonholonomic Hamiltonian system with symmetry $(T^*Q, G, \omega, \mathcal{D}, H)$, where $H : T^*Q \to \mathbb{R}$ is a G-invariant Hamiltonian, and the completely nonholonomic constraints $\mathcal{D} \subset TQ$ is a G-invariant distribution, that is, the tangent of the group action maps $\mathcal{D}_q$ to $\mathcal{D}_{gq}$ for any $q \in Q$. Since the Legendre transformation $\mathcal{F}L : TQ \to T^*Q$ is a fiber-preserving map, then $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{F}L(\mathcal{D}) \subset T^*Q$ is G-invariant, and the quotient space $\bar{\mathcal{M}} = \mathcal{M}/G$ of the G-orbit in $\mathcal{M}$ is a smooth manifold with projection $\pi_{/G} : \mathcal{M} \to \bar{\mathcal{M}}(\subset T^*Q/G)$ which is a surjective submersion. From Bates and Śniatycki [3], we know that there exists a distribution $\bar{\mathcal{K}}$, a non-degenerate distributional two-form $\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}$ and a vector field $X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}$ on $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$ which takes values in the constraint distribution $\bar{\mathcal{K}}$, such that the following equation holds, that is, $\mathbf{i}_{X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}}\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} = \mathbf{d}h_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}$, where $\mathbf{d}h_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}$ is the restriction of $\mathbf{d}h_{\bar{\mathcal{M}}}$ to $\bar{\mathcal{K}}$ and $h_{\bar{\mathcal{M}}} \cdot \pi_{/G} = H_\mathcal{M}$ is the restriction of H to $\mathcal{M}$. In this case, the triple $(\bar{\mathcal{K}}, \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}, h)$ is a nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system, and $X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}$ is a nonholonomic reduced dynamical vector field.

In particular, we assume that the Lie group G is not Abelian, and the cotangent lifted G-action on T^*Q is free, proper and symplectic, and admits a Ad^*-equivariant momentum map $\mathbf{J} : T^*Q \to \mathfrak{g}^*$, where $\mathfrak{g}$ is a Lie algebra of G and $\mathfrak{g}^*$ is the dual of $\mathfrak{g}$. Let $\mu \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ be a regular value of $\mathbf{J}$ and denote by G_μ the isotropy subgroup of the coadjoint G-action at the point $\mu \in \mathfrak{g}^*$, which is defined by $G_\mu = \{g \in G | \,\mathrm{Ad}_g^*\mu = \mu\}$. Since $G_\mu(\subset G)$ acts freely and properly on Q and on T^*Q, then G_μ acts also freely and properly on $\mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu)$, so that the space $(T^*Q)_\mu = \mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu)/G_\mu$ is a symplectic manifold with symplectic form ω_μ uniquely characterized by the relation

$$\pi_\mu^*\omega_\mu = i_\mu^*\omega. \tag{2.3}$$

The map $i_\mu : \mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu) \to T^*Q$ is the inclusion and $\pi_\mu : \mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu) \to (T^*Q)_\mu$ is the projection. The pair $((T^*Q)_\mu, \omega_\mu)$ is the Marsden-Weinstein reduced space of (T^*Q, ω) at μ, (see Marsden and Weinstein [32], Marsden [27], and Marsden et al. [28]). In the following we assume that for the regular value $\mu \in \mathfrak{g}^*$, the constraint submanifold $\mathcal{M}$ is clean intersection with $\mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu)$, that is, $\mathcal{M} \cap \mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu) \neq \emptyset$. Note that $\mathcal{M}$ is also $G_\mu(\subset G)$ action invariant, and so is $\mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu)$, because $\mathbf{J}$ is Ad^*-equivariant. It follows that the quotient space $\mathcal{M}_\mu = (\mathcal{M} \cap \mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu))/G_\mu \subset (T^*Q)_\mu$, which is the G_μ-orbit in $\mathcal{M} \cap \mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu)$, is a smooth manifold with projection $\pi_\mu : \mathcal{M} \cap \mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu) \to \mathcal{M}_\mu$ which is a surjective submersion.

In the following we shall describe the dynamics of the nonholonomic Hamiltonian system with symmetry and momentum map $(T^*Q, G, \omega, \mathbf{J}, \mathcal{D}, H)$ by using the method given by Bates and Śniatycki in [3]. Assume that the distribution $T(\mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu)) \cap \mathcal{F}$ pushes down to a distribution $\mathcal{F}_\mu = T\pi_\mu(T(\mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu)) \cap \mathcal{F})$ on $(T^*Q)_\mu$ along $\mathcal{M}_\mu$, and h_μ is reduced Hamiltonian function $h_\mu : (T^*Q)_\mu \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by $h_\mu \cdot \pi_\mu = H \cdot i_\mu$. We consider the following nonholonomic constraints condition

$$(\mathbf{i}_{X_\mu}\omega_\mu - \mathbf{d}h_\mu)_{|\mathcal{M}_\mu} \in \mathcal{F}_\mu^\circ, \qquad X_\mu \in T\mathcal{M}_\mu, \tag{2.4}$$

from Cantrijn et al. [6], we know that there exists an unique nonholonomic vector field X_μ satisfying the above condition (2.4), if the admissibility condition $\dim\mathcal{M}_\mu = \mathrm{rank}\mathcal{F}_\mu$ and the compatibility condition $T\mathcal{M}_\mu \cap \mathcal{F}_\mu^\perp = \{0\}$ hold, where $\mathcal{F}_\mu^\perp$ denotes the symplectic orthogonal of $\mathcal{F}_\mu$ with respect to the reduced symplectic form ω_μ. In the same way given by Bates and Śniatycki in [3], we know that there exists a distribution $\mathcal{K}_\mu$, a non-degenerate reduced distributional two-form $\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}$ and a vector field $X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}$ on the reduced constraint submanifold $\mathcal{M}_\mu = (\mathcal{M} \cap \mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu))/G_\mu$, such that the equation $\mathbf{i}_{X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}}\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} = \mathbf{d}h_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}$ holds. Then the triple $(\mathcal{K}_\mu, \omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}, h)$ is a $\mathbf{J}$-nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system, and $X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}$ is a $\mathbf{J}$-nonholonomic reduced dynamical vector field.

It is well-known that Hamilton-Jacobi theory from the variational point of view is originally developed by Jacobi in 1866, which states that the integral of Lagrangian of a system along the solution of its Euler-Lagrange equation satisfies the Hamilton-Jacobi equation. The classical description of this problem from the geometrical point of view is given by Abraham and Marsden in [1]. Recently, Wang in [43] gave two types of geometric Hamilton-Jacobi theorems for Hamiltonian system and the regular reducible Hamiltonian system on the cotangent bundle of a configuration manifold, by using the symplectic structures and (reduced) dynamical vector fields. This work offers an important idea that one can use the dynamical vector fields of the (reduced) Hamiltonian systems to describe Hamilton-Jacobi equations. Thus, it is a natural idea that we hope to use the dynamical vector fields of distributional Hamiltonian system and nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system to describe the Hamilton-Jacobi equations for nonholonomic (reducible) Hamiltonian systems, that is, we hope to generalize two types of geometric Hamilton-Jacobi theorems for Hamiltonian system and the regular reducible Hamiltonian systems given in [43] to the nonholonomic context, and give a variety of Hamilton-Jacobi theorems for nonholonomic (reduced) Hamiltonian systems.

3 Hamilton-Jacobi Theorem for a Distributional Hamiltonian System

In this section, we shall prove two types of geometric Hamilton-Jacobi theorem of a nonholonomic Hamiltonian system. In order to do this, we need first to describe the dynamics of the nonholonomic Hamiltonian system following the results given by Bates and Śniatycki in [3], (see also Cushman et al. [11] and [12] for more details).

From now on, we assume that $L : TQ \to \mathbb{R}$ is a hyperregular Lagrangian, and the Legendre transformation $\mathcal{F}L : TQ \to T^*Q$ is a diffeomorphism. As above, our nonholonomic constraint $\mathcal{D} \subset TQ$ is $\mathcal{D}$-completely and $\mathcal{D}$-regularly, and let $\mathcal{D}^0 \subset T^*Q$ its annihilator. From §2, we can define the constraint submanifold $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{F}L(\mathcal{D}) \subset T^*Q$, $i_{\mathcal{M}} : \mathcal{M} \to T^*Q$, and $\omega_{\mathcal{M}} = i^*_{\mathcal{M}}\omega$, that is, the symplectic form $\omega_{\mathcal{M}}$ is induced from the canonical symplectic form ω on T^*Q, where $i^*_{\mathcal{M}} : T^*T^*Q \to T^*\mathcal{M}$. For the distribution $\mathcal{F} = (T\pi_Q)^{-1}(\mathcal{D}) \subset TT^*Q$, we define the distribution $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{F} \cap T\mathcal{M}$. Note that $\mathcal{K}^\perp = \mathcal{F}^\perp \cap T\mathcal{M}$, where $\mathcal{K}^\perp$ denotes the symplectic orthogonal of $\mathcal{K}$ with respect to the canonical symplectic form ω, and the admissibility condition $\dim\mathcal{M} = \operatorname{rank}\mathcal{F}$ and the compatibility condition $T\mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{F}^\perp = \{0\}$ hold, then we know that the restriction of the symplectic form $\omega_{\mathcal{M}}$ on $T^*\mathcal{M}$ fibrewise to the distribution $\mathcal{K}$, that is, $\omega_{\mathcal{K}} = \tau_{\mathcal{K}} \cdot \omega_{\mathcal{M}}$ is non-degenerate, where $\tau_{\mathcal{K}}$ is the restriction map to distribution $\mathcal{K}$. It is worthy of note that $\omega_{\mathcal{K}}$ is not a true two-form on a manifold, so it does not make sense to speak about it being closed. We call $\omega_{\mathcal{K}}$ as a distributional two-form to avoid any confusion. Because $\omega_{\mathcal{K}}$ is non-degenerate as a bilinear form on each fibre of $\mathcal{K}$, there exists a vector field $X_{\mathcal{K}}$ on $\mathcal{M}$ which takes values in the constraint distribution $\mathcal{K}$, such that the following nonholonomic constraints condition holds, that is,

$$\mathbf{i}_{X_{\mathcal{K}}}\omega_{\mathcal{K}} = \mathbf{d}H_{\mathcal{K}}, \tag{3.1}$$

where $\mathbf{d}H_{\mathcal{K}}$ is the restriction of $\mathbf{d}H_{\mathcal{M}}$ to $\mathcal{K}$ and $H_{\mathcal{M}} = \tau_{\mathcal{M}} \cdot H$ is the restriction of H to $\mathcal{M}$. (3.1) is called the distributional Hamiltonian equation, see Bates and Śniatycki [3]. Thus, the geometric formulation of the distributional Hamiltonian system may be summarized as follows.

Definition 3.1 *(Distributional Hamiltonian System) Assume that the 4-tuple* $(T^*Q, \omega, \mathcal{D}, H)$ *is a* $\mathcal{D}$*-completely and* $\mathcal{D}$*-regularly nonholonomic Hamiltonian system, where* $\mathcal{D} \subset TQ$ *is a* $\mathcal{D}$*-completely and* $\mathcal{D}$*-regularly nonholonomic constraint of the system. If there exist a distribution* $\mathcal{K}$*, a non-degenerate distributional two-form* $\omega_{\mathcal{K}}$ *and a vector field* $X_{\mathcal{K}}$ *on the constraint submanifold* $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{F}L(\mathcal{D}) \subset T^*Q$*, such that the distributional Hamiltonian equation* $\mathbf{i}_{X_{\mathcal{K}}}\omega_{\mathcal{K}} = \mathbf{d}H_{\mathcal{K}}$ *holds, where* $\mathbf{d}H_{\mathcal{K}}$ *is the restriction of* $\mathbf{d}H_{\mathcal{M}}$ *to* $\mathcal{K}$ *as defined above, then the triple* $(\mathcal{K}, \omega_{\mathcal{K}}, H)$ *is called a distributional Hamiltonian system of the nonholonomic Hamiltonian system* $(T^*Q, \omega, \mathcal{D}, H)$*, and* $X_{\mathcal{K}}$ *is called a nonholonomic dynamical vector field of the distributional Hamiltonian system* $(\mathcal{K}, \omega_{\mathcal{K}}, H)$*. Under the above circumstances, we refer to* $(T^*Q, \omega, \mathcal{D}, H)$ *as a nonholonomic Hamiltonian system with an associated distributional Hamiltonian system* $(\mathcal{K}, \omega_{\mathcal{K}}, H)$*.*

Given a nonholonomic Hamiltonian system $(T^*Q, \omega, \mathcal{D}, H)$ with an associated distributional Hamiltonian system $(\mathcal{K}, \omega_{\mathcal{K}}, H)$, and using the non-degenerate distributional two-form $\omega_{\mathcal{K}}$ and the nonholonomic dynamical vector field $X_{\mathcal{K}}$, we can prove two types of geometric Hamilton-Jacobi theorem for the distributional Hamiltonian system $(\mathcal{K}, \omega_{\mathcal{K}}, H)$. In order to do this, we need first give two important notions and a key lemma, (see also Wang [43]), which is obtained by a careful modification for the corresponding results of Abraham and Marsden in [1]. This lemma offers also an important tool for the proofs of the two types of Hamilton-Jacobi theorems for the distributional Hamiltonian system and the nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system.

Let Q be a smooth manifold and TQ its tangent bundle, T^*Q its cotangent bundle with the canonical symplectic form ω, and $\mathcal{D} \subset TQ$ is a $\mathcal{D}$-regularly nonholonomic constraint, and the projection $\pi_Q : T^*Q \to Q$ induces the map $T\pi_Q : TT^*Q \to TQ$. Assume that $\gamma : Q \to T^*Q$ is an one-form on Q, if γ is closed, then $\mathbf{d}\gamma(x, y) = 0$, $\forall\, x, y \in TQ$. In the following we introduce two weaker notions.

Definition 3.2 (i) *The one-form γ is called to be closed with respect to $T\pi_Q : TT^*Q \to TQ$, if for any $v, w \in TT^*Q$, we have $\mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(v), T\pi_Q(w)) = 0$;*

(ii) *The one-form γ is called to be closed on $\mathcal{D}$ with respect to $T\pi_Q : TT^*Q \to TQ$, if for any $v, w \in TT^*Q$, and $T\pi_Q(v),\ T\pi_Q(w) \in \mathcal{D}$, we have $\mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(v), T\pi_Q(w)) = 0$.*

From the above definition we know that, the notion that γ is closed on $\mathcal{D}$ with respect to $T\pi_Q : TT^*Q \to TQ$, is weaker than the notion that γ is closed with respect to $T\pi_Q : TT^*Q \to TQ$. From Wang [43] we also know that the latter, that is, γ is closed with respect to $T\pi_Q : TT^*Q \to TQ$, is weaker than the notion that γ is closed. Thus, the notion that γ is closed on $\mathcal{D}$ with respect to $T\pi_Q : TT^*Q \to TQ$, is weaker than that γ is closed on $\mathcal{D}$, that is, $\mathbf{d}\gamma(x, y) = 0$, $\forall\, x, y \in \mathcal{D}$.

Lemma 3.3 *Assume that $\gamma : Q \to T^*Q$ is an one-form on Q, and $\lambda = \gamma \cdot \pi_Q : T^*Q \to T^*Q$. Then we have that*

(i) *for any $x, y \in TQ$, $\gamma^*\omega(x, y) = -\mathbf{d}\gamma(x, y)$, and for any $v, w \in TT^*Q$, $\lambda^*\omega(v, w) = -\mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(v),\ T\pi_Q(w))$, since ω is the canonical symplectic form on T^*Q;*

(ii) *for any $v, w \in TT^*Q$, $\omega(T\lambda \cdot v, w) = \omega(v, w - T\lambda \cdot w) - \mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(v),\ T\pi_Q(w))$;*

(iii) *If L is $\mathcal{D}$-regular, and $Im(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{M} = \mathcal{F}L(\mathcal{D})$, then we have that $X_H \cdot \gamma \in \mathcal{F}$ along γ, and $X_H \cdot \lambda \in \mathcal{F}$ along λ, that is, $T\pi_Q(X_H \cdot \gamma(q)) \in \mathcal{D}_q$, $\forall q \in Q$, and $T\pi_Q(X_H \cdot \lambda(q, p)) \in \mathcal{D}_q$, $\forall q \in Q$, $(q, p) \in T^*Q$.*

Proof: We first prove (i). Since ω is the canonical symplectic form on T^*Q, we know that there is an unique canonical one-form θ, such that $\omega = -\mathbf{d}\theta$. From the Proposition 3.2.11 in Abraham and Marsden [1], we have that for the one-form $\gamma : Q \to T^*Q$, $\gamma^*\theta = \gamma$. Then we can obtain that

$$\gamma^*\omega(x, y) = \gamma^*(-\mathbf{d}\theta)(x, y) = -\mathbf{d}(\gamma^*\theta)(x, y) = -\mathbf{d}\gamma(x, y).$$

Note that $\lambda = \gamma \cdot \pi_Q : T^*Q \to T^*Q$, and $\lambda^* = \pi_Q^* \cdot \gamma^* : T^*T^*Q \to T^*T^*Q$, then we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda^*\omega(v, w) &= \lambda^*(-\mathbf{d}\theta)(v, w) = -\mathbf{d}(\lambda^*\theta)(v, w) = -\mathbf{d}(\pi_Q^* \cdot \gamma^*\theta)(v, w)\\ &= -\mathbf{d}(\pi_Q^* \cdot \gamma)(v, w) = -\mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(v),\ T\pi_Q(w)).\end{aligned}$$

It follows that (i) holds.

Next, we prove (ii). For any $v, w \in TT^*Q$, note that $v - T(\gamma \cdot \pi_Q) \cdot v$ is vertical, because

$$T\pi_Q(v - T(\gamma \cdot \pi_Q) \cdot v) = T\pi_Q(v) - T(\pi_Q \cdot \gamma \cdot \pi_Q) \cdot v = T\pi_Q(v) - T\pi_Q(v) = 0,$$

where we used the relation $\pi_Q \cdot \gamma \cdot \pi_Q = \pi_Q$. Thus, $\omega(v - T(\gamma \cdot \pi_Q) \cdot v, w - T(\gamma \cdot \pi_Q) \cdot w) = 0$, and hence,

$$\omega(T(\gamma \cdot \pi_Q) \cdot v,\ w) = \omega(v,\ w - T(\gamma \cdot \pi_Q) \cdot w) + \omega(T(\gamma \cdot \pi_Q) \cdot v,\ T(\gamma \cdot \pi_Q) \cdot w).$$

However, the second term on the right-hand side is given by

$$\omega(T(\gamma \cdot \pi_Q) \cdot v,\ T(\gamma \cdot \pi_Q) \cdot w) = \gamma^*\omega(T\pi_Q(v),\ T\pi_Q(w)) = -\mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(v),\ T\pi_Q(w)),$$

where we used the conclusion (i). It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\omega(T\lambda \cdot v, w) &= \omega(T(\gamma \cdot \pi_Q) \cdot v,\ w) \\ &= \omega(v,\ w - T(\gamma \cdot \pi_Q) \cdot w) - \mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(v),\ T\pi_Q(w)) \\ &= \omega(v, w - T\lambda \cdot w) - \mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(v),\ T\pi_Q(w)).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, (ii) holds.

At last, we prove (iii). For any $q \in Q,\ (q,p) \in T^*Q$, we have that

$$X_H \cdot \gamma(q) = (\frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i}\frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} - \frac{\partial H}{\partial q^i}\frac{\partial}{\partial p_i})\gamma(q).$$

and

$$X_H \cdot \lambda(q,p) = (\frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i}\frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} - \frac{\partial H}{\partial q^i}\frac{\partial}{\partial p_i})\gamma \cdot \pi_Q(q,p).$$

Then,

$$T\pi_Q(X_H \cdot \gamma(q)) = T\pi_Q(X_H \cdot \lambda(q,p)) = (\frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i}\frac{\partial}{\partial q^i})\gamma(q) = \gamma^*(\frac{\partial H(q,p)}{\partial p_i})\frac{\partial}{\partial q^i},$$

where $\gamma^* : T^*T^*Q \to T^*Q$. Since $\mathrm{Im}(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{M}$, and $\gamma^*(\frac{\partial H(q,p)}{\partial p_i}) \in \mathcal{M}_{(q,p)} = \mathcal{F}L(\mathcal{D}_q)$, from L is $\mathcal{D}$-regular, $\mathcal{F}L$ is a diffeomorphism, then there exists a $v_q \in \mathcal{D}_q$, such that $\mathcal{F}L(v_q) = \gamma^*(\frac{\partial H(q,p)}{\partial p_i})$. Thus,

$$T\pi_Q(X_H \cdot \gamma(q)) = T\pi_Q(X_H \cdot \lambda(q,p)) = \mathcal{F}L(v_q)\frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} \in \mathcal{D},$$

it follows that $X_H \cdot \gamma \in \mathcal{F}$ along γ, and $X_H \cdot \lambda \in \mathcal{F}$ along λ. ■

By using the above Lemma 3.3, we can prove the following two types of geometric Hamilton-Jacobi theorem for the nonholonomic Hamiltonian system $(T^*Q, \omega, \mathcal{D}, H)$ with an associated distributional Hamiltonian system $(\mathcal{K}, \omega_{\mathcal{K}}, H)$. At first, by using the fact that the one-form $\gamma : Q \to T^*Q$ is closed on $\mathcal{D}$ with respect to $T\pi_Q : TT^*Q \to TQ$, we can prove the Type I of geometric Hamilton-Jacobi theorem for the distributional Hamiltonian system. For convenience, the maps involved in the following theorem and its proof are shown in Diagram-1.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{M} \arrow[r, "i_{\mathcal{M}}"] \arrow[d, "X_{\mathcal{K}}"'] & T^*Q \arrow[r, "\pi_Q"] \arrow[d, "X_H"'] & Q \arrow[r, "\gamma"] \arrow[d, "X_H^\gamma"'] & T^*Q \arrow[d, "X_H"] \\
\mathcal{K} & T(T^*Q) \arrow[l, "\tau_{\mathcal{K}}"'] & TQ \arrow[l, "T\gamma"'] & T(T^*Q) \arrow[l, "T\pi_Q"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

Diagram-1

Theorem 3.4 *(Type I of Hamilton-Jacobi Theorem for a Distributional Hamiltonian System) For the nonholonomic Hamiltonian system* $(T^*Q,\omega,\mathcal{D},H)$ *with an associated distributional Hamiltonian system* $(\mathcal{K},\omega_{\mathcal{K}},H)$*, assume that* $\gamma: Q\to T^*Q$ *is a one-form on* Q*, and* $X_H^\gamma = T\pi_Q\cdot X_H\cdot\gamma$*, where* X_H *is the dynamical vector field of the corresponding unconstrained Hamiltonian system* (T^*Q,ω,H)*. Moreover, assume that* $Im(\gamma)\subset\mathcal{M}=\mathcal{F}L(\mathcal{D})$*, and* $Im(T\gamma)\subset\mathcal{K}$*. If the one-form* $\gamma: Q\to T^*Q$ *is closed on* $\mathcal{D}$ *with respect to* $T\pi_Q: TT^*Q\to TQ$*, then* γ *is a solution of the equation* $T\gamma\cdot X_H^\gamma = X_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot\gamma$*. Here* $X_{\mathcal{K}}$ *is the dynamical vector field of the distributional Hamiltonian system* $(\mathcal{K},\omega_{\mathcal{K}},H)$*. The equation* $T\gamma\cdot X_H^\gamma = X_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot\gamma$ *is called the Type I of Hamilton-Jacobi equation for the distributional Hamiltonian system* $(\mathcal{K},\omega_{\mathcal{K}},H)$*.*

Proof: At first, we note that $\mathrm{Im}(\gamma)\subset\mathcal{M}$, and $\mathrm{Im}(T\gamma)\subset\mathcal{K}$, in this case, $\omega_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot\tau_{\mathcal{K}} = \tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot\omega_{\mathcal{M}} = \tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^*\cdot\omega$, along $\mathrm{Im}(T\gamma)$. Thus, using the non-degenerate distributional two-form $\omega_{\mathcal{K}}$, from Lemma 3.3, if we take that $v = X_H\cdot\gamma\in\mathcal{F}$, and for any $w\in\mathcal{F}$, $T\lambda(w)\neq 0$, and $\tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot w\neq 0$, then we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\omega_{\mathcal{K}}(T\gamma\cdot X_H^\gamma,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot w) = \omega_{\mathcal{K}}(\tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot T\gamma\cdot X_H^\gamma,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot w)\\
&= \tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^*\cdot\omega(T\gamma\cdot X_H^\gamma,\ w) = \tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^*\cdot\omega(T(\gamma\cdot\pi_Q)\cdot X_H\cdot\gamma,\ w)\\
&= \tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^*\cdot(\omega(X_H\cdot\gamma,\ w - T(\gamma\cdot\pi_Q)\cdot w) - \mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(X_H\cdot\gamma),\ T\pi_Q(w)))\\
&= \tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^*\cdot\omega(X_H\cdot\gamma,\ w) - \tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^*\cdot\omega(X_H\cdot\gamma,\ T(\gamma\cdot\pi_Q)\cdot w)\\
&\quad - \tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^*\cdot\mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(X_H\cdot\gamma),\ T\pi_Q(w))\\
&= \omega_{\mathcal{K}}(\tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot X_H\cdot\gamma,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot w) - \omega_{\mathcal{K}}(\tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot X_H\cdot\gamma,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot T(\gamma\cdot\pi_Q)\cdot w)\\
&\quad - \tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^*\cdot\mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(X_H\cdot\gamma),\ T\pi_Q(w))\\
&= \omega_{\mathcal{K}}(X_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot\gamma,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot w) - \omega_{\mathcal{K}}(X_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot\gamma,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot T\gamma\cdot T\pi_Q(w))\\
&\quad - \tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^*\cdot\mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(X_H\cdot\gamma),\ T\pi_Q(w)),
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $\tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot T\gamma = T\gamma$, and $\tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot X_H\cdot\gamma = X_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot\gamma$, since $\mathrm{Im}(T\gamma)\subset\mathcal{K}$. If the one-form $\gamma: Q\to T^*Q$ is closed on $\mathcal{D}$ with respect to $T\pi_Q: TT^*Q\to TQ$, then we have that $\mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(X_H\cdot\gamma),\ T\pi_Q(w)) = 0$, since $X_H\cdot\gamma,\ w\in\mathcal{F}$, and $T\pi_Q(X_H\cdot\gamma),\ T\pi_Q(w)\in\mathcal{D}$, and hence

$$\tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^*\cdot\mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(X_H\cdot\gamma),\ T\pi_Q(w)) = 0,$$

and

$$\omega_{\mathcal{K}}(T\gamma\cdot X_H^\gamma,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot w) - \omega_{\mathcal{K}}(X_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot\gamma,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot w) = -\omega_{\mathcal{K}}(\tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot X_H\cdot\gamma,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot T\gamma\cdot T\pi_Q(w)). \tag{3.2}$$

If γ satisfies the equation $T\gamma\cdot X_H^\gamma = X_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot\gamma$, from Lemma 3.3(i) we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
-\omega_{\mathcal{K}}(X_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot\gamma,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot T\gamma\cdot T\pi_Q(w)) &= -\omega_{\mathcal{K}}(T\gamma\cdot X_H^\gamma,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot T\gamma\cdot T\pi_Q(w))\\
&= -\omega_{\mathcal{K}}(\tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot T\gamma\cdot X_H^\gamma,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot T\gamma\cdot T\pi_Q(w))\\
&= -\tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^*\cdot\omega(T\gamma\cdot T\pi_Q(X_H\cdot\gamma),\ T\gamma\cdot T\pi_Q(w))\\
&= -\tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^*\cdot\gamma^*\omega(T\pi_Q(X_H\cdot\gamma),\ T\pi_Q(w))\\
&= \tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^*\cdot\mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(X_H\cdot\gamma),\ T\pi_Q(w)) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Because the distributional two-form $\omega_{\mathcal{K}}$ is non-degenerate, the left side of (3.2) equals zero, only when γ satisfies the equation $T\gamma\cdot X_H^\gamma = X_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot\gamma$. Thus, if the one-form $\gamma: Q\to T^*Q$ is closed on $\mathcal{D}$ with respect to $T\pi_Q: TT^*Q\to TQ$, then γ must be a solution of the Type I of Hamilton-Jacobi equation $T\gamma\cdot X_H^\gamma = X_\mathcal{K}\cdot\gamma$. ■

Next, for any symplectic map $\varepsilon: T^*Q\rightarrow T^*Q$, we can prove the following Type II of geometric Hamilton-Jacobi theorem for the distributional Hamiltonian system. For convenience, the maps involved in the following theorem and its proof are shown in Diagram-2.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{M} \arrow[r, "i_\mathcal{M}"] \arrow[d, "X_\mathcal{K}"'] & T^*Q \arrow[r, "\pi_Q"] \arrow[d, "X_{H\cdot\varepsilon}"'] \arrow[dr, "X_H^\varepsilon"] & Q \arrow[r, "\gamma"] & T^*Q \arrow[d, "X_H"] \\
\mathcal{K} & T(T^*Q) \arrow[l, "\tau_\mathcal{K}"'] & TQ \arrow[l, "T\gamma"'] & T(T^*Q) \arrow[l, "T\pi_Q"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

Diagram-2

Theorem 3.5 *(Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi Theorem for a Distributional Hamiltonian System) For the nonholonomic Hamiltonian system $(T^*Q,\omega,\mathcal{D},H)$ with an associated distributional Hamiltonian system $(\mathcal{K},\omega_\mathcal{K},H)$, assume that $\gamma: Q\rightarrow T^*Q$ is a one-form on Q, and $\lambda=\gamma\cdot\pi_Q: T^*Q\rightarrow T^*Q$, and for any symplectic map $\varepsilon: T^*Q\rightarrow T^*Q$, denote by $X_H^\varepsilon = T\pi_Q\cdot X_H\cdot\varepsilon$, where X_H is the dynamical vector field of the corresponding unconstrained Hamiltonian system (T^*Q,ω,H). Moreover, assume that $Im(\gamma)\subset\mathcal{M}=\mathcal{F}L(\mathcal{D})$, and $Im(T\gamma)\subset\mathcal{K}$. If ε is a solution of the equation $\tau_\mathcal{K}\cdot T\varepsilon(X_{H\cdot\varepsilon}) = T\lambda\cdot X_H\cdot\varepsilon$, if and only if it is a solution of the equation $T\gamma\cdot X_H^\varepsilon = X_\mathcal{K}\cdot\varepsilon$. Here $X_{H\cdot\varepsilon}$ is the Hamiltonian vector field of the function $H\cdot\varepsilon: T^*Q\rightarrow\mathbb{R}$, and $X_\mathcal{K}$ is the dynamical vector field of the distributional Hamiltonian system $(\mathcal{K},\omega_\mathcal{K},H)$. The equation $T\gamma\cdot X_H^\varepsilon = X_\mathcal{K}\cdot\varepsilon$, is called the Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi equation for the distributional Hamiltonian system $(\mathcal{K},\omega_\mathcal{K},H)$.*

Proof: In the same way, we note that $\mathrm{Im}(\gamma)\subset\mathcal{M}$, and $\mathrm{Im}(T\gamma)\subset\mathcal{K}$, in this case, $\omega_\mathcal{K}\cdot\tau_\mathcal{K} = \tau_\mathcal{K}\cdot\omega_\mathcal{M} = \tau_\mathcal{K}\cdot i^*_\mathcal{M}\cdot\omega$, along $\mathrm{Im}(T\gamma)$. Thus, using the non-degenerate distributional two-form $\omega_\mathcal{K}$, from Lemma 3.3, if we take that $v=\tau_\mathcal{K}\cdot X_H\cdot\varepsilon = X_\mathcal{K}\cdot\varepsilon\in\mathcal{K}(\subset\mathcal{F})$, and for any $w\in\mathcal{F}$, $T\lambda(w)\neq 0$, and $\tau_\mathcal{K}\cdot w\neq 0$, then we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\omega_\mathcal{K}(T\gamma\cdot X_H^\varepsilon,\ \tau_\mathcal{K}\cdot w) = \omega_\mathcal{K}(\tau_\mathcal{K}\cdot T\gamma\cdot X_H^\varepsilon,\ \tau_\mathcal{K}\cdot w)\\
&= \tau_\mathcal{K}\cdot i^*_\mathcal{M}\cdot\omega(T\gamma\cdot X_H^\varepsilon,\ w) = \tau_\mathcal{K}\cdot i^*_\mathcal{M}\cdot\omega(T(\gamma\cdot\pi_Q)\cdot X_H\cdot\varepsilon,\ w)\\
&= \tau_\mathcal{K}\cdot i^*_\mathcal{M}\cdot(\omega(X_H\cdot\varepsilon,\ w-T(\gamma\cdot\pi_Q)\cdot w) - \mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(X_H\cdot\varepsilon),\ T\pi_Q(w)))\\
&= \tau_\mathcal{K}\cdot i^*_\mathcal{M}\cdot\omega(X_H\cdot\varepsilon,\ w) - \tau_\mathcal{K}\cdot i^*_\mathcal{M}\cdot\omega(X_H\cdot\varepsilon,\ T\lambda\cdot w)\\
&\quad\ - \tau_\mathcal{K}\cdot i^*_\mathcal{M}\cdot\mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(X_H\cdot\varepsilon),\ T\pi_Q(w))\\
&= \omega_\mathcal{K}(\tau_\mathcal{K}\cdot X_H\cdot\varepsilon,\ \tau_\mathcal{K}\cdot w) - \omega_\mathcal{K}(\tau_\mathcal{K}\cdot X_H\cdot\varepsilon,\ \tau_\mathcal{K}\cdot T\lambda\cdot w)\\
&\quad\ + \tau_\mathcal{K}\cdot i^*_\mathcal{M}\cdot\lambda^*\omega(X_H\cdot\varepsilon,\ w)\\
&= \omega_\mathcal{K}(X_\mathcal{K}\cdot\varepsilon,\ \tau_\mathcal{K}\cdot w) - \omega_\mathcal{K}(\tau_\mathcal{K}\cdot X_H\cdot\varepsilon,\ T\lambda\cdot w) + \omega_\mathcal{K}(T\lambda\cdot X_H\cdot\varepsilon,\ T\lambda\cdot w),
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $\tau_\mathcal{K}\cdot T\gamma = T\gamma$, $\tau_\mathcal{K}\cdot T\lambda = T\lambda$, and $\tau_\mathcal{K}\cdot X_H\cdot\varepsilon = X_\mathcal{K}\cdot\varepsilon$, since $\mathrm{Im}(T\gamma)\subset\mathcal{K}$. Note that $\varepsilon: T^*Q\rightarrow T^*Q$ is symplectic, and $X_H\cdot\varepsilon = T\varepsilon\cdot X_{H\cdot\varepsilon}$, along ε, and hence $\tau_\mathcal{K}\cdot X_H\cdot\varepsilon = \tau_\mathcal{K}\cdot T\varepsilon\cdot X_{H\cdot\varepsilon}$, along ε. Then we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\omega_\mathcal{K}(T\gamma\cdot X_H^\varepsilon,\ \tau_\mathcal{K}\cdot w) - \omega_\mathcal{K}(X_\mathcal{K}\cdot\varepsilon,\ \tau_\mathcal{K}\cdot w)\\
&= -\omega_\mathcal{K}(\tau_\mathcal{K}\cdot X_H\cdot\varepsilon,\ T\lambda\cdot w) + \omega_\mathcal{K}(T\lambda\cdot X_H\cdot\varepsilon,\ T\lambda\cdot w)\\
&= \omega_\mathcal{K}(T\lambda\cdot X_H\cdot\varepsilon - \tau_\mathcal{K}\cdot T\varepsilon\cdot X_{H\cdot\varepsilon},\ T\lambda\cdot w).
\end{aligned}$$

Because the two-form $\omega_{\mathcal{K}}$ is non-degenerate, it follows that the equation $T\gamma \cdot X_H^{\varepsilon} = X_{\mathcal{K}} \cdot \varepsilon$, is equivalent to the equation $\tau_{\mathcal{K}} \cdot T\varepsilon \cdot X_{H\cdot\varepsilon} = T\lambda \cdot X_H \cdot \varepsilon$. Thus, ε is a solution of the equation $\tau_{\mathcal{K}} \cdot T\varepsilon \cdot X_{H\cdot\varepsilon} = T\lambda \cdot X_H \cdot \varepsilon$, if and only if it is a solution of the Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi equation $T\gamma \cdot X_H^{\varepsilon} = X_{\mathcal{K}} \cdot \varepsilon$. $\blacksquare$

Remark 3.6 *If the Hamiltonian system we considered has not any constrains, in this case, the distributional Hamiltonian system is just the Hamiltonian system itself. From the above Type I and Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi theorems, that is, Theorem* 3.4 *and Theorem* 3.5*, we can get the Theorem* 2.5 *and Theorem* 2.6 *in Wang [43]. It shows that Theorem* 3.4 *and Theorem* 3.5 *are the generalization of two types of geometric Hamilton-Jacobi theorem for Hamiltonian system given in [43] to the nonholonomic context.*

Remark 3.7 *It is worthy of note that, in general, the dynamical vector field of the nonholonomic Hamiltonian system may not be Hamiltonian, and the distributional Hamiltonian system is not yet a Hamiltonian system, and hence we can not describe the Hamilton-Jacobi equation for a distributional Hamiltonian system from the viewpoint of generating function as in the classical case. Thus, the formulations of Type I and Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi equation for a distributional Hamiltonian system, given by Theorem* 3.4 *and Theorem* 3.5*, have more extensive sense. On the other hand, if* γ *is a solution of the classical Hamilton-Jacobi equation, that is,* $X_H \cdot \gamma = 0$*, which is equivalent to the equation* $\mathbf{d}(H \cdot \gamma) = 0$*, or* $H(q, \gamma(q)) = E$*,* $q \in Q$*, and* E *is a constant, in this case,* $X_H^{\gamma} = T\pi_Q \cdot X_H \cdot \gamma = 0$*, and hence from the Type I of Hamilton-Jacobi equation, we have that* $X_{\mathcal{K}} \cdot \gamma = T\gamma \cdot X_H^{\gamma} = 0$*. Since the classical Hamilton-Jacobi equation* $X_H \cdot \gamma = 0$*, shows that the dynamical vector field of the corresponding unconstrained Hamiltonian system* (T^*Q, ω, H) *is degenerate along* γ*, then the equation* $X_{\mathcal{K}} \cdot \gamma = 0$*, shows that the dynamical vector field of the distributional Hamiltonian system* $(\mathcal{K}, \omega_{\mathcal{K}}, H)$ *is degenerate along* γ*. The equation* $X_{\mathcal{K}} \cdot \gamma = 0$ *is called the classical Hamilton-Jacobi equation for the distributional Hamiltonian system* $(\mathcal{K}, \omega_{\mathcal{K}}, H)$*. In addition, for a symplectic map* $\varepsilon : T^*Q \to T^*Q$*, if* $X_H \cdot \varepsilon = 0$*, then from the Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi equation, we have that* $X_{\mathcal{K}} \cdot \varepsilon = T\gamma \cdot X_H^{\varepsilon} = 0$*. But, from the equation* $\tau_{\mathcal{K}} \cdot T\varepsilon \cdot X_{H\cdot\varepsilon} = T\lambda \cdot X_H \cdot \varepsilon$*, we know that* $X_{\mathcal{K}} \cdot \varepsilon = 0$ *is not equivalent to* $X_{H\cdot\varepsilon} = 0$*.*

Remark 3.8 *If the one-form* $\gamma : Q \to T^*Q$ *is not closed on* $\mathcal{D}$ *with respect to* $T\pi_Q : TT^*Q \to TQ$*, then we know that* γ *is not yet closed on* $\mathcal{D}$*, that is,* $\mathbf{d}\gamma(x, y) \neq 0$*,* $\forall\ x, y \in \mathcal{D}$*, and hence* γ *is not yet closed on* Q*. However, in this case, we note that* $\mathbf{d} \cdot \mathbf{d}\gamma = \mathbf{d}^2\gamma = 0$*, and hence the* $\mathbf{d}\gamma$ *is a closed two-form on* Q*. Thus, we can construct a magnetic symplectic form on* T^*Q*,* $\hat{\omega} = \omega + \pi_Q^*(\mathbf{d}\gamma)$*, and a magnetic nonholonomic Hamiltonian system* $(T^*Q, \hat{\omega}, \mathcal{D}, H)$ *with an associated magnetic distributional Hamiltonian system* $(\mathcal{K}, \hat{\omega}_{\mathcal{K}}, H)$*, which satisfies the magnetic distributional Hamiltonian equation* $\mathbf{i}_{\hat{X}_{\mathcal{K}}}\hat{\omega} = \mathbf{d}H_{\mathcal{K}}$*. Moreover, we can prove that the Type I and Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi theorem hold, for the magnetic distributional Hamiltonian system* $(\mathcal{K}, \hat{\omega}_{\mathcal{K}}, H)$*. See de León and Wang [25] for more details.*

4 Hamilton-Jacobi Theorem for a Reduced Distributional Hamiltonian System

In this section, we shall consider a nonholonomic Hamiltonian system with symmetry, and prove two types of Hamilton-Jacobi theorem for a nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system, which are extensions of the above two types of Hamilton-Jacobi theorem for distributional Hamiltonian system under nonholonomic reduction. In order to do this, we need first to describe the nonholonomic reduction and the dynamics of a nonholonomic Hamiltonian system with symmetry. In the following we shall state carefully how to construct the nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system, which has been introduced by Bates and Śniatycki in [3], see also, Cushman et al. [11] and [12]. Now, we assume that the 5-tuple $(T^*Q, G, \omega, \mathcal{D}, H)$ is a $\mathcal{D}$-completely and $\mathcal{D}$-regularly nonholonomic Hamiltonian system with symmetry, and the Lie group G acts smoothly on Q by the left, and we also consider the natural lifted actions on TQ and T^*Q, and assume that the cotangent lifted action on T^*Q is free, proper and symplectic. The orbit space T^*Q/G is a smooth manifold and the canonical projection $\pi_{/G} : T^*Q \to T^*Q/G$ is a surjective submersion.

Assume that $H : T^*Q \to \mathbb{R}$ is a G-invariant Hamiltonian, and that the $\mathcal{D}$-completely and $\mathcal{D}$-regularly nonholonomic constraints $\mathcal{D} \subset TQ$ is a G-invariant distribution, that is, the tangent of the group action maps $\mathcal{D}_q$ to $\mathcal{D}_{gq}$ for any $q \in Q$. Note that the Legendre transformation $\mathcal{F}L : TQ \to T^*Q$ is a fiber-preserving map, from §2, then $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{F}L(\mathcal{D}) \subset T^*Q$ is G-invariant, and the quotient space $\bar{\mathcal{M}} = \mathcal{M}/G$ of the G-orbit in $\mathcal{M}$ is a smooth manifold with projection $\pi_{/G} : \mathcal{M} \to \bar{\mathcal{M}} (\subset T^*Q/G)$, which is a surjective submersion.

Since G is the symmetry group of the system, all intrinsically defined vector fields and distributions push down to $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$. In particular, the vector field $X_{\mathcal{M}}$ on $\mathcal{M}$ pushes down to a vector field $X_{\bar{\mathcal{M}}} = T\pi_{/G} \cdot X_{\mathcal{M}}$, and the distribution $\mathcal{K}$ pushes down to a distribution $T\pi_{/G} \cdot \mathcal{K}$ on $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$, and the Hamiltonian H pushes down to h, such that $h \cdot \pi_{/G} = \tau_{\mathcal{M}} \cdot H$. However, $\omega_{\mathcal{K}}$ need not push down to a distributional two-form defined on $T\pi_{/G} \cdot \mathcal{K}$, despite of the fact that $\omega_{\mathcal{K}}$ is G-invariant. This is because there may be infinitesimal symmetry $\eta_{\mathcal{K}}$ that lies in $\mathcal{M}$, such that $\mathbf{i}_{\eta_{\mathcal{K}}} \omega_{\mathcal{K}} \neq 0$. From Bates and Śniatycki [3], we know that to eliminate this difficulty, $\omega_{\mathcal{K}}$ is restricted to a sub-distribution $\mathcal{U}$ of $\mathcal{K}$ defined by

$$\mathcal{U} = \{u \in \mathcal{K} \mid \omega_{\mathcal{K}}(u, v) = 0, \quad \forall\, v \in \mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{K}\},$$

where $\mathcal{V}$ is the distribution on $\mathcal{M}$ tangent to the orbits of G in $\mathcal{M}$ and is spanned by the infinitesimal symmetries. Clearly, $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ are both G-invariant, project down to $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$ and $T\pi_{/G} \cdot \mathcal{V} = 0$. Define $\bar{\mathcal{K}}$ by $\bar{\mathcal{K}} = T\pi_{/G} \cdot \mathcal{U}$. Moreover, we take that $\omega_{\mathcal{U}} = \tau_{\mathcal{U}} \cdot \omega_{\mathcal{M}}$ is the restriction of the symplectic form $\omega_{\mathcal{M}}$ on $T^*\mathcal{M}$ fibrewise to the distribution $\mathcal{U}$, where $\tau_{\mathcal{U}}$ is the restriction map to distribution $\mathcal{U}$, and the $\omega_{\mathcal{U}}$ pushes down to a non-degenerate distributional two-form $\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}$ on $\bar{\mathcal{K}}$, such that $\pi^*_{/G}\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} = \omega_{\mathcal{U}}$. Because $\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}$ is non-degenerate as a bilinear form on each fibre of $\bar{\mathcal{K}}$, there exists a vector field $X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}$ on $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$ which takes values in the constraint distribution $\bar{\mathcal{K}}$, such that the reduced distributional Hamiltonian equation holds, that is, $\mathbf{i}_{X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}} \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} = \mathbf{d}h_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}$, where $\mathbf{d}h_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}$ is the restriction of $\mathbf{d}h_{\bar{\mathcal{M}}}$ to $\bar{\mathcal{K}}$ and $h_{\bar{\mathcal{M}}} \cdot \pi_{/G} = H_{\mathcal{M}} = \tau_{\mathcal{M}} \cdot H$ is the restriction of H to $\mathcal{M}$. In addition, the vector fields $X_{\mathcal{K}}$ and $X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}$ are $\pi_{/G}$-related. Thus, the geometrical formulation of a nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system may be summarized as follows.

Definition 4.1 *(Nonholonomic Reduced Distributional Hamiltonian System) Assume that the 5-tuple* $(T^*Q, G, \omega, \mathcal{D}, H)$ *is a* $\mathcal{D}$*-completely and* $\mathcal{D}$*-regularly nonholonomic Hamiltonian system with symmetry, where* $\mathcal{D} \subset TQ$ *is a* $\mathcal{D}$*-completely and* $\mathcal{D}$*-regularly nonholonomic constraint of the system, and* $\mathcal{D}$ *and* H *are both* G*-invariant. If there exists a distribution* $\bar{\mathcal{K}}$*, a non-degenerate distributional two-form* $\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}$ *and a vector field* $X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}$ *on the constraint submanifold* $\bar{\mathcal{M}} = \mathcal{M}/G$*, where* $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{F}L(\mathcal{D}) \subset T^*Q$*, such that the reduced distributional Hamiltonian equation* $\mathbf{i}_{X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}} \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} = \mathbf{d}h_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}$ *holds, where* h *is the reduced Hamiltonian, that is,* $h \cdot \pi_{/G} = \tau_{\mathcal{M}} \cdot H$*, then the triple* $(\bar{\mathcal{K}}, \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}, h)$ *is called a nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system of the nonholonomic Hamiltonian system with symmetry* $(T^*Q, G, \omega, \mathcal{D}, H)$*, and* $X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}$ *is called a nonholonomic reduced dynamical vector field of the nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system* $(\bar{\mathcal{K}}, \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}, h)$*. Under* *the above circumstances, we refer to $(T^*Q, G, \omega, \mathcal{D}, H)$ as a nonholonomic reducible Hamiltonian system with an associated nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system $(\bar{\mathcal{K}}, \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}, h)$.*

Given a nonholonomic reducible Hamiltonian system with symmetry $(T^*Q, G, \omega, \mathcal{D}, H)$ with an associated nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system $(\bar{\mathcal{K}}, \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}, h)$, and using the non-degenerate reduced distributional two-form $\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}$ and the nonholonomic reduced dynamical vector field $X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}$, we can prove the following two types of Hamilton-Jacobi theorem for the nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system $(\bar{\mathcal{K}}, \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}, h)$. At first, using the fact that the one-form $\gamma : Q \to T^*Q$ is closed on $\mathcal{D}$ with respect to $T\pi_Q : TT^*Q \to TQ$, we can prove the Type I of geometric Hamilton-Jacobi theorem for the nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system. For convenience, the maps involved in the following theorem and its proof are shown in Diagram-3.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{M} \arrow[r, "i_{\mathcal{M}}"] \arrow[d, "X_{\mathcal{K}}"'] & T^*Q \arrow[r, "\pi_Q"] \arrow[d, "X_H"'] & Q \arrow[r, "\gamma"] \arrow[d, "X_H^{\gamma}"'] & T^*Q \arrow[r, "\pi_{/G}"] \arrow[d, "X_H"'] & T^*Q/G \arrow[d, "X_h"'] & \bar{\mathcal{M}} \arrow[l, "i_{\bar{\mathcal{M}}}"'] \arrow[d, "X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}"'] \\
\mathcal{K} & T(T^*Q) \arrow[l, "\tau_{\mathcal{K}}"'] & TQ \arrow[l, "T\gamma"'] & T(T^*Q) \arrow[l, "T\pi_Q"'] \arrow[r, "T\pi_{/G}"] & T(T^*Q/G) \arrow[r, "\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}"] & \bar{\mathcal{K}}
\end{tikzcd}$$

Diagram-3

Theorem 4.2 *(Type I of Hamilton-Jacobi Theorem for a Nonholonomic Reduced Distributional Hamiltonian System) For the nonholonomic reducible Hamiltonian system $(T^*Q, G, \omega, \mathcal{D}, H)$ with an associated nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system $(\bar{\mathcal{K}}, \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}, h)$, assume that $\gamma : Q \to T^*Q$ is an one-form on Q, and $X_H^{\gamma} = T\pi_Q \cdot X_H \cdot \gamma$, where X_H is the dynamical vector field of the corresponding unconstrained Hamiltonian system with symmetry (T^*Q, G, ω, H). Moreover, assume that Im$(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{M}$, and it is G-invariant, Im$(T\gamma) \subset \mathcal{K}$, and $\bar{\gamma} = \pi_{/G}(\gamma) : Q \to T^*Q/G$. If the one-form $\gamma : Q \to T^*Q$ is closed on $\mathcal{D}$ with respect to $T\pi_Q : TT^*Q \to TQ$, then $\bar{\gamma}$ is a solution of the equation $T\bar{\gamma} \cdot X_H^{\gamma} = X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot \bar{\gamma}$. Here $X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}$ is the dynamical vector field of the nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system $(\bar{\mathcal{K}}, \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}, h)$. The equation $T\bar{\gamma} \cdot X_H^{\gamma} = X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot \bar{\gamma}$, is called the Type I of Hamilton-Jacobi equation for the nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system $(\bar{\mathcal{K}}, \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}, h)$.*

Proof: At first, from Theorem 3.4, we know that γ is a solution of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation $T\gamma \cdot X_H^{\gamma} = X_{\mathcal{K}} \cdot \gamma$. Next, we note that Im$(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{M}$, and it is G-invariant, Im$(T\gamma) \subset \mathcal{K}$, and hence Im$(T\bar{\gamma}) \subset \bar{\mathcal{K}}$, in this case, $\pi^*_{/G} \cdot \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} = \tau_{\mathcal{U}} \cdot \omega_{\mathcal{M}} = \tau_{\mathcal{U}} \cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}} \cdot \omega$, along Im$(T\bar{\gamma})$. Thus, using the non-degenerate distributional two-form $\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}$, from Lemma 3.3, if we take that $v = \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot T\pi_{/G} \cdot X_H \cdot \gamma = X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot \bar{\gamma} \in \bar{\mathcal{K}}$, and for any $w \in \mathcal{F}$, $T\lambda(w) \neq 0$, and $\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot T\pi_{/G} \cdot w \neq 0$, then we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(T\bar{\gamma}\cdot X_H^\gamma,\ \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot T\pi_{/G}\cdot w) = \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot T(\pi_{/G}\cdot\gamma)\cdot X_H^\gamma,\ \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot T\pi_{/G}\cdot w)\\
&= \pi_{/G}^*\cdot\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(T\gamma\cdot X_H^\gamma,\ w) = \tau_{\mathcal{U}}\cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^*\cdot\omega(T\gamma\cdot X_H^\gamma,\ w)\\
&= \tau_{\mathcal{U}}\cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^*\cdot\omega(T(\gamma\cdot\pi_Q)\cdot X_H\cdot\gamma,\ w)\\
&= \tau_{\mathcal{U}}\cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^*\cdot(\omega(X_H\cdot\gamma,\ w - T(\gamma\cdot\pi_Q)\cdot w) - \mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(X_H\cdot\gamma),\ T\pi_Q(w)))\\
&= \tau_{\mathcal{U}}\cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^*\cdot\omega(X_H\cdot\gamma,\ w) - \tau_{\mathcal{U}}\cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^*\cdot\omega(X_H\cdot\gamma,\ T(\gamma\cdot\pi_Q)\cdot w)\\
&\quad - \tau_{\mathcal{U}}\cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^*\cdot\mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(X_H\cdot\gamma),\ T\pi_Q(w))\\
&= \pi_{/G}^*\cdot\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(X_H\cdot\gamma,\ w) - \pi_{/G}^*\cdot\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(X_H\cdot\gamma,\ T(\gamma\cdot\pi_Q)\cdot w)\\
&\quad - \tau_{\mathcal{U}}\cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^*\cdot\mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(X_H\cdot\gamma),\ T\pi_Q(w))\\
&= \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot T\pi_{/G}(X_H\cdot\gamma),\ \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot T\pi_{/G}\cdot w) - \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot T\pi_{/G}(X_H\cdot\gamma),\ \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot T(\pi_{/G}\cdot\gamma)\cdot T\pi_Q(w))\\
&\quad - \tau_{\mathcal{U}}\cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^*\cdot\mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(X_H\cdot\gamma),\ T\pi_Q(w))\\
&= \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot T\pi_{/G}(X_H)\cdot\pi_{/G}(\gamma),\ \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot T\pi_{/G}\cdot w) - \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot T\pi_{/G}(X_H)\cdot\pi_{/G}(\gamma),\ \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot T\bar{\gamma}\cdot T\pi_Q(w))\\
&\quad - \tau_{\mathcal{U}}\cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^*\cdot\mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(X_H\cdot\gamma),\ T\pi_Q(w))\\
&= \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\bar{\gamma},\ \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot T\pi_{/G}\cdot w) - \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\bar{\gamma},\ T\bar{\gamma}\cdot T\pi_Q(w)) - \tau_{\mathcal{U}}\cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^*\cdot\mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(X_H\cdot\gamma),\ T\pi_Q(w)),
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot T\pi_{/G}(X_H)\cdot\bar{\gamma} = \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot X_h\cdot\bar{\gamma} = X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\bar{\gamma}$, and $\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot T\bar{\gamma} = T\bar{\gamma}$, since $\operatorname{Im}(T\bar{\gamma})\subset\bar{\mathcal{K}}$. If the one-form $\gamma: Q\to T^*Q$ is closed on $\mathcal{D}$ with respect to $T\pi_Q: TT^*Q\to TQ$, then we have that $\mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(X_H\cdot\gamma),\ T\pi_Q(w)) = 0$, since $X_H\cdot\gamma,\ w\in\mathcal{F}$, and $T\pi_Q(X_H\cdot\gamma),\ T\pi_Q(w)\in\mathcal{D}$, and hence

$$\tau_{\mathcal{U}}\cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^*\cdot\mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(X_H\cdot\gamma),\ T\pi_Q(w)) = 0,$$

and

$$\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(T\bar{\gamma}\cdot X_H^\gamma,\ \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot T\pi_{/G}\cdot w) - \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\bar{\gamma},\ \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot T\pi_{/G}\cdot w) = -\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\bar{\gamma},\ T\bar{\gamma}\cdot T\pi_Q(w)). \tag{4.1}$$

If $\bar{\gamma}$ satisfies the equation $T\bar{\gamma}\cdot X_H^\gamma = X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\bar{\gamma}$, from Lemma 3.3(i) we know that the right side of (4.1) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
-\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\bar{\gamma},\ T\bar{\gamma}\cdot T\pi_Q(w)) &= -\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(T\bar{\gamma}\cdot X_H^\gamma,\ T\bar{\gamma}\cdot T\pi_Q(w))\\
&= -\bar{\gamma}^*\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(T\pi_Q\cdot X_H\cdot\gamma,\ T\pi_Q(w))\\
&= -\gamma^*\cdot\pi_{/G}^*\cdot\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(T\pi_Q\cdot X_H\cdot\gamma,\ T\pi_Q(w))\\
&= -\gamma^*\cdot\tau_{\mathcal{U}}\cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^*\cdot\omega(T\pi_Q(X_H\cdot\gamma),\ T\pi_Q(w))\\
&= -\tau_{\mathcal{U}}\cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^*\cdot\gamma^*\omega(T\pi_Q(X_H\cdot\gamma),\ T\pi_Q(w))\\
&= \tau_{\mathcal{U}}\cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^*\cdot\mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(X_H\cdot\gamma),\ T\pi_Q(w)) = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma^*\cdot\tau_{\mathcal{U}}\cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^*\cdot\omega = \tau_{\mathcal{U}}\cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^*\cdot\gamma^*\cdot\omega$, because $\operatorname{Im}(\gamma)\subset\mathcal{M}$. But, because the reduced distributional two-form $\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}$ is non-degenerate, the left side of (4.1) equals zero, only when $\bar{\gamma}$ satisfies the equation $T\bar{\gamma}\cdot X_H^\gamma = X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\bar{\gamma}$. Thus, if the one-form $\gamma: Q\to T^*Q$ is closed on $\mathcal{D}$ with respect to $T\pi_Q: TT^*Q\to TQ$, then $\bar{\gamma}$ must be a solution of the Type I of Hamilton-Jacobi equation $T\bar{\gamma}\cdot X_H^\gamma = X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\bar{\gamma}$. ■

Next, for any G-invariant symplectic map $\varepsilon: T^*Q\to T^*Q$, we can prove the following Type II of geometric Hamilton-Jacobi theorem for the nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system. For convenience, the maps involved in the following theorem and its proof are shown in Diagram-4.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{M} \arrow[r, "i_{\mathcal{M}}"] \arrow[d, "X_{\mathcal{K}}"'] & T^*Q \arrow[r, "\pi_Q"] \arrow[d, "X_{H\cdot\varepsilon}"'] \arrow[dr, "X_H^\varepsilon"] & Q \arrow[r, "\gamma"] & T^*Q \arrow[r, "\pi_{/G}"] \arrow[d, "X_H"'] & T^*Q/G \arrow[d, "X_h"'] & \bar{\mathcal{M}} \arrow[l, "i_{\bar{\mathcal{M}}}"'] \arrow[d, "X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}"'] \\
\mathcal{K} & T(T^*Q) \arrow[l, "\tau_{\mathcal{K}}"'] & TQ \arrow[l, "T\gamma"'] & T(T^*Q) \arrow[l, "T\pi_Q"'] \arrow[r, "T\pi_{/G}"] & T(T^*Q/G) \arrow[r, "\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}"] & \bar{\mathcal{K}}
\end{tikzcd}$$

Diagram-4

Theorem 4.3 *(Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi Theorem for a Nonholonomic Reduced Distributional Hamiltonian System) For the nonholonomic reducible Hamiltonian system* $(T^*Q, G, \omega, \mathcal{D}, H)$ *with an associated nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system* $(\bar{\mathcal{K}}, \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}, h)$*, assume that* $\gamma : Q \to T^*Q$ *is an one-form on* Q*, and* $\lambda = \gamma \cdot \pi_Q : T^*Q \to T^*Q$*, and for any* G*-invariant symplectic map* $\varepsilon : T^*Q \to T^*Q$*, denote by* $X_H^\varepsilon = T\pi_Q \cdot X_H \cdot \varepsilon$*, where* X_H *is the dynamical vector field of the corresponding unconstrained Hamiltonian system with symmetry* (T^*Q, G, ω, H)*. Moreover, assume that* $Im(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{M}$*, and it is* G*-invariant,* $Im(T\gamma) \subset \mathcal{K}$*, and* $\bar{\gamma} = \pi_{/G}(\gamma) : Q \to T^*Q/G$*, and* $\bar{\lambda} = \pi_{/G}(\lambda) : T^*Q \to T^*Q/G$*, and* $\bar{\varepsilon} = \pi_{/G}(\varepsilon) : T^*Q \to T^*Q/G$*. Then* ε *and* $\bar{\varepsilon}$ *satisfy the equation* $\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot T\bar{\varepsilon} \cdot X_{h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}} = T\bar{\lambda} \cdot X_H \cdot \varepsilon$*, if and only if they satisfy the equation* $T\bar{\gamma} \cdot X_H^\varepsilon = X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot \bar{\varepsilon}$*. Here* $X_{h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}}$ *is the Hamiltonian vector field of the function* $h \cdot \bar{\varepsilon} : T^*Q \to \mathbb{R}$*, and* $X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}$ *is the dynamical vector field of the nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system* $(\bar{\mathcal{K}}, \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}, h)$*. The equation* $T\bar{\gamma} \cdot X_H^\varepsilon = X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot \bar{\varepsilon}$*, is called the Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi equation for the nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system* $(\bar{\mathcal{K}}, \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}, h)$*.*

Proof: In the same way, we note that $\mathrm{Im}(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{M}$, and it is G-invariant, $\mathrm{Im}(T\gamma) \subset \mathcal{K}$, and hence $\mathrm{Im}(T\bar{\gamma}) \subset \bar{\mathcal{K}}$, in this case, $\pi_{/G}^* \cdot \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} = \tau_{\mathcal{U}} \cdot \omega_{\mathcal{M}} = \tau_{\mathcal{U}} \cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^* \cdot \omega$, along $\mathrm{Im}(T\bar{\gamma})$. Thus, using the non-degenerate distributional two-form $\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}$, from Lemma 3.3, if we take that $v = \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot T\pi_{/G} \cdot X_H \cdot \varepsilon = X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot \bar{\varepsilon} \in \bar{\mathcal{K}}$, and for any $w \in \mathcal{F}$, $T\lambda(w) \neq 0$, and $\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot T\pi_{/G} \cdot w \neq 0$, then we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(T\bar{\gamma} \cdot X_H^\varepsilon,\ \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot T\pi_{/G} \cdot w) = \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot T(\pi_{/G} \cdot \gamma) \cdot X_H^\varepsilon,\ \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot T\pi_{/G} \cdot w) \\
&= \pi_{/G}^* \cdot \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(T\gamma \cdot X_H^\varepsilon,\ w) = \tau_{\mathcal{U}} \cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^* \cdot \omega(T\gamma \cdot X_H^\varepsilon,\ w) \\
&= \tau_{\mathcal{U}} \cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^* \cdot \omega(T(\gamma \cdot \pi_Q) \cdot X_H \cdot \varepsilon,\ w) \\
&= \tau_{\mathcal{U}} \cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^* \cdot (\omega(X_H \cdot \varepsilon,\ w - T(\gamma \cdot \pi_Q) \cdot w) - \mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(X_H \cdot \varepsilon),\ T\pi_Q(w))) \\
&= \tau_{\mathcal{U}} \cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^* \cdot \omega(X_H \cdot \varepsilon,\ w) - \tau_{\mathcal{U}} \cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^* \cdot \omega(X_H \cdot \varepsilon,\ T\lambda \cdot w) - \tau_{\mathcal{U}} \cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^* \cdot \mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(X_H \cdot \varepsilon),\ T\pi_Q(w)) \\
&= \pi_{/G}^* \cdot \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(X_H \cdot \varepsilon,\ w) - \pi_{/G}^* \cdot \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(X_H \cdot \varepsilon,\ T\lambda \cdot w) + \tau_{\mathcal{U}} \cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^* \cdot \lambda^*\omega(X_H \cdot \varepsilon,\ w) \\
&= \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot T\pi_{/G}(X_H \cdot \varepsilon),\ \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot T\pi_{/G} \cdot w) - \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot T\pi_{/G}(X_H \cdot \varepsilon),\ \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot T(\pi_{/G} \cdot \lambda) \cdot w) \\
&\quad + \pi_{/G}^* \cdot \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(T\lambda \cdot X_H \cdot \varepsilon,\ T\lambda \cdot w) \\
&= \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot T\pi_{/G}(X_H) \cdot \pi_{/G}(\varepsilon),\ \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot T\pi_{/G} \cdot w) - \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot T\pi_{/G}(X_H) \cdot \pi_{/G}(\varepsilon),\ \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot T\bar{\lambda} \cdot w) \\
&\quad + \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot T\pi_{/G} \cdot T\lambda \cdot X_H \cdot \varepsilon,\ \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot T\pi_{/G} \cdot T\lambda \cdot w) \\
&= \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot \bar{\varepsilon},\ \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot T\pi_{/G} \cdot w) - \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot X_h \cdot \bar{\varepsilon},\ T\bar{\lambda} \cdot w) + \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(T\bar{\lambda} \cdot X_H \cdot \varepsilon,\ T\bar{\lambda} \cdot w),
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot T\pi_{/G}(X_H) \cdot \bar{\varepsilon} = \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(X_h) \cdot \bar{\varepsilon} = X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot \bar{\varepsilon}$, and $\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot T\pi_{/G} \cdot T\lambda = T\bar{\lambda}$, since $\mathrm{Im}(T\bar{\gamma}) \subset \bar{\mathcal{K}}$. Note that $\varepsilon : T^*Q \to T^*Q$ is symplectic, and $\bar{\varepsilon}^* = \varepsilon^* \cdot \pi_{/G}^* : T^*(T^*Q)/G \to T^*T^*Q$ is also symplectic along $\bar{\varepsilon}$, and hence $X_h \cdot \bar{\varepsilon} = T\bar{\varepsilon} \cdot X_{h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}}$, along $\bar{\varepsilon}$, and hence $\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot X_h \cdot \bar{\varepsilon} = \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot T\bar{\varepsilon} \cdot X_{h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}}$, along $\bar{\varepsilon}$. Then we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(T\bar{\gamma} \cdot X_H^\varepsilon,\ \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot T\pi_{/G} \cdot w) - \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot \bar{\varepsilon},\ \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot T\pi_{/G} \cdot w) \\
&= -\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot X_h \cdot \bar{\varepsilon},\ T\bar{\lambda} \cdot w) + \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(T\bar{\lambda} \cdot X_H \cdot \varepsilon,\ T\bar{\lambda} \cdot w) \\
&= \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(T\bar{\lambda} \cdot X_H \cdot \varepsilon - \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot T\bar{\varepsilon} \cdot X_{h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}},\ T\bar{\lambda} \cdot w).
\end{aligned}$$

Because the distributional two-form $\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}$ is non-degenerate, it follows that the equation $T\bar{\gamma}\cdot X_H^{\varepsilon} = X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}$, is equivalent to the equation $T\bar{\lambda}\cdot X_H\cdot\varepsilon = \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot T\bar{\varepsilon}\cdot X_{h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}}$. Thus, ε and $\bar{\varepsilon}$ satisfy the equation $T\bar{\lambda}\cdot X_H\cdot\varepsilon = \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot T\bar{\varepsilon}\cdot X_{h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}}$, if and only if they satisfy the Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi equation $T\bar{\gamma}\cdot X_H^{\varepsilon} = X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}$. ■

For the nonholonomic reducible Hamiltonian system $(T^*Q, G, \omega, \mathcal{D}, H)$ with an associated nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system $(\bar{\mathcal{K}}, \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}, h)$, we know that the nonholonomic dynamical vector field $X_{\mathcal{K}}$ and the nonholonomic reduced dynamical vector field $X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}$ are $\pi_{/G}$-related, that is, $X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\pi_{/G} = T\pi_{/G}\cdot X_{\mathcal{K}}$. Then we can prove the following Theorem 4.4, which states the relationship between the solutions of Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi equations and nonholonomic reduction.

Theorem 4.4 *For the nonholonomic reducible Hamiltonian system $(T^*Q, G, \omega, \mathcal{D}, H)$ with an associated nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system $(\bar{\mathcal{K}}, \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}, h)$, assume that $\gamma : Q \to T^*Q$ is an one-form on Q, and $\lambda = \gamma\cdot\pi_Q : T^*Q \to T^*Q$, and $\varepsilon : T^*Q \to T^*Q$ is a G-invariant symplectic map. Moreover, assume that Im(γ) $\subset \mathcal{M}$, and it is G-invariant, Im($T\gamma$) $\subset \mathcal{K}$, and $\bar{\gamma} = \pi_{/G}(\gamma) : Q \to T^*Q/G$, and $\bar{\lambda} = \pi_{/G}(\lambda) : T^*Q \to T^*Q/G$, and $\bar{\varepsilon} = \pi_{/G}(\varepsilon) : T^*Q \to T^*Q/G$. Then ε is a solution of the Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi equation, $T\gamma\cdot X_H^{\varepsilon} = X_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot\varepsilon$, for the distributional Hamiltonian system $(\mathcal{K}, \omega_{\mathcal{K}}, H)$, if and only if ε and $\bar{\varepsilon}$ satisfy the Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi equation $T\bar{\gamma}\cdot X_H^{\varepsilon} = X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}$, for the nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system $(\bar{\mathcal{K}}, \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}, h)$.*

Proof: Note that $\mathrm{Im}(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{M}$, $\mathrm{Im}(T\gamma) \subset \mathcal{K}$, and hence $\mathrm{Im}(T\bar{\gamma}) \subset \bar{\mathcal{K}}$, in this case, $\pi_{/G}^*\cdot\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} = \tau_{\mathcal{U}}\cdot\omega_{\mathcal{M}} = \tau_{\mathcal{U}}\cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^*\cdot\omega$, along $\mathrm{Im}(T\bar{\gamma})$, and $\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot T\bar{\gamma} = T\bar{\gamma}$, $\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} = X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}$. Since nonholonomic vector field $X_{\mathcal{K}}$ and the nonholonomic reduced vector field $X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}$ are $\pi_{/G}$-related, that is, $X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\pi_{/G} = T\pi_{/G}\cdot X_{\mathcal{K}}$, using the non-degenerate distributional two-form $\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(T\bar{\gamma}\cdot X_H^{\varepsilon} - X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\bar{\varepsilon},\ \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot T\pi_{/G}\cdot w)\\
&= \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(T\bar{\gamma}\cdot X_H^{\varepsilon},\ \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot T\pi_{/G}\cdot w) - \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\bar{\varepsilon},\ \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot T\pi_{/G}\cdot w)\\
&= \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot T\bar{\gamma}\cdot X_H^{\varepsilon},\ \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot T\pi_{/G}\cdot w) - \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\pi_{/G}\cdot\varepsilon,\ \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot T\pi_{/G}\cdot w)\\
&= \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(T\pi_{/G}\cdot T\gamma\cdot X_H^{\varepsilon},\ T\pi_{/G}\cdot w) - \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(T\pi_{/G}\cdot X_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot\varepsilon,\ T\pi_{/G}\cdot w)\\
&= \pi_{/G}^*\cdot\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(T\gamma\cdot X_H^{\varepsilon},\ w) - \pi_{/G}^*\cdot\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(X_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot\varepsilon,\ w)\\
&= \tau_{\mathcal{U}}\cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^*\cdot\omega(T\gamma\cdot X_H^{\varepsilon},\ w) - \tau_{\mathcal{U}}\cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^*\cdot\omega(X_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot\varepsilon,\ w).
\end{aligned}$$

In the case we considered, $\tau_{\mathcal{U}}\cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^*\cdot\omega = \tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot i_{\mathcal{M}}^*\cdot\omega = \omega_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot\tau_{\mathcal{K}}$, and $\tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot T\gamma = T\gamma$, $\tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot X_{\mathcal{K}} = X_{\mathcal{K}}$, since $\mathrm{Im}(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{M}$, and $\mathrm{Im}(T\gamma) \subset \mathcal{K}$. Thus, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}(T\bar{\gamma}\cdot X_H^{\varepsilon} - X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\bar{\varepsilon},\ \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot T\pi_{/G}\cdot w)\\
&= \omega_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot\tau_{\mathcal{K}}(T\gamma\cdot X_H^{\varepsilon},\ w) - \omega_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot\tau_{\mathcal{K}}(X_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot\varepsilon,\ w)\\
&= \omega_{\mathcal{K}}(\tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot T\gamma\cdot X_H^{\varepsilon},\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot w) - \omega_{\mathcal{K}}(\tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot X_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot\varepsilon,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot w)\\
&= \omega_{\mathcal{K}}(T\gamma\cdot X_H^{\varepsilon} - X_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot\varepsilon,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot w).
\end{aligned}$$

Because the distributional two-form $\omega_{\mathcal{K}}$ and the reduced distributional two-form $\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}$ are non-degenerate, it follows that the equation $T\bar{\gamma}\cdot X_H^{\varepsilon} = X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}$, is equivalent to the equation $T\gamma\cdot X_H^{\varepsilon} = X_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot\varepsilon$. Thus, ε is a solution of the Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi equation $T\gamma\cdot X_H^{\varepsilon} = X_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot\varepsilon$, for the distributional Hamiltonian system $(\mathcal{K}, \omega_{\mathcal{K}}, H)$, if and only if ε and $\bar{\varepsilon}$ satisfy the Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi equation $T\bar{\gamma}\cdot X_H^{\varepsilon} = X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}$, for the nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system $(\bar{\mathcal{K}}, \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}, h)$. $\blacksquare$

Remark 4.5 *It is worthy of note that, since the nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system may not be a Hamiltonian system, then we can not describe the Hamilton-Jacobi equation for a nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system from the viewpoint of generating function as in the classical case. Thus, the formulations of Type I and Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi equation for a nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system, given by Theorem* 4.2 *and Theorem* 4.3*, have more extensive sense. On the other hand, if* γ *is a solution of the classical Hamilton-Jacobi equation, that is,* $X_H\cdot\gamma = 0$*, then* $X_H^{\gamma} = T\pi_Q\cdot X_H\cdot\gamma = 0$*, and hence from the Type I of Hamilton-Jacobi equation, we have that* $X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\bar{\gamma} = T\bar{\gamma}\cdot X_H^{\gamma} = 0$*. Because the classical Hamilton-Jacobi equation* $X_H\cdot\gamma = 0$*, shows that the dynamical vector field of the corresponding unconstrained Hamiltonian system* (T^*Q, ω, H) *is degenerate along* γ*, then the equation* $X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\bar{\gamma} = 0$*, shows that the dynamical vector field of the nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system* $(\bar{\mathcal{K}}, \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}, h)$ *is degenerate along* $\bar{\gamma}$*. The equation* $X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\bar{\gamma} = 0$ *is called the classical Hamilton-Jacobi equation for the nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system* $(\bar{\mathcal{K}}, \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}, h)$*. In addition, for a symplectic map* $\varepsilon : T^*Q \to T^*Q$*, if* $X_H\cdot\varepsilon = 0$*, then from the Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi equation, we have that* $X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\bar{\varepsilon} = T\bar{\gamma}\cdot X_H^{\varepsilon} = 0$*. But, from the equation* $T\bar{\lambda}\cdot X_H\cdot\varepsilon = \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot T\bar{\varepsilon}\cdot X_{h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}}$*, we know that the equation* $X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\bar{\varepsilon} = 0$ *is not equivalent to the equation* $X_{h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}} = 0$.

5 Nonholonomic Hamiltonian System with Symmetry and Momentum Map

As it is well known that momentum map is a very important notion in modern study of geometric mechanics, and it is a geometric generalization of the classical linear and angular momentum. A fundamental fact about momentum map is that if the Hamiltonian H is invariant under the action of a Lie group G, then the vector valued function $\mathbf{J}$ is a constant of the motion for the dynamics of the Hamiltonian vector field X_H associated to H, that is, all momentum maps are conserved quantities. Moreover, momentum map has infinitesimal equivariance, such that it plays an important role in the study of reduction theory of Hamiltonian systems with symmetries, see Marsden [27], Marsden et al. [28], and Marsden et al. [29]. Now, it is a natural problem what and how we could do, when the Hamiltonian system we considered has nonholonomic constrains, and the Lie group G is not Abelian, and $G_\mu \neq G$, where G_μ is the isotropy subgroup of coadjoint G-action at the point $\mu \in \mathfrak{g}^*$, and hence the above procedure of nonholonomic reduction given in §4 does not work or is not efficient enough. In this section, we shall consider a nonholonomic Hamiltonian system with symmetry and momentum map, and give two types of Hamilton-Jacobi theorem of the nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system with respect to momentum map. At first, we need to give carefully a geometric formulation of the $\mathbf{J}$-nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system, by using momentum map and the nonholonomic Marsden-Weinstein reduction. Now, we assume that the 6-tuple $(T^*Q, G, \omega, \mathbf{J}, \mathcal{D}, H)$ is a $\mathcal{D}$-completely and $\mathcal{D}$-regularly nonholonomic Hamiltonian system with symmetry and momentum map, and the Lie group G, which may not be Abelian, acts smoothly by the left on Q, its tangent lifted action on TQ and its cotangent lifted action on T^*Q, and we assume that the action is free, proper and symplectic, and admits a Ad^*-equivariant momentum map $\mathbf{J} : T^*Q \to \mathfrak{g}^*$, where $\mathfrak{g}$ is a Lie algebra of G and $\mathfrak{g}^*$ is the dual of $\mathfrak{g}$. Let $\mu \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ be a regular value of $\mathbf{J}$ and denote by G_μ the isotropy subgroup of the coadjoint G-action at the point $\mu \in \mathfrak{g}^*$, which is defined by $G_\mu = \{g \in G |\, \mathrm{Ad}_g^* \mu = \mu\}$. Since $G_\mu (\subset G)$ acts freely and properly on Q and on T^*Q, then G_μ acts also freely and properly on $\mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu)$, so that the space $(T^*Q)_\mu = \mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu)/G_\mu$ is a symplectic manifold with symplectic form ω_μ uniquely characterized by the relation

$$\pi_\mu^*\omega_\mu = i_\mu^*\omega. \tag{5.1}$$

The map $i_\mu : \mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu) \to T^*Q$ is the inclusion and $\pi_\mu : \mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu) \to (T^*Q)_\mu$ is the projection. The pair $((T^*Q)_\mu, \omega_\mu)$ is the Marsden-Weinstein reduced space of (T^*Q, ω) at μ.

Remark 5.1 *Let (T^*Q, ω) be a connected symplectic manifold, and $\mathbf{J} : T^*Q \to \mathfrak{g}^*$ a non-equivariant momentum map with a non-equivariance group one-cocycle $\sigma : G \to \mathfrak{g}^*$, which is defined by $\sigma(g) := \mathbf{J}(g \cdot z) - \mathrm{Ad}^*_{g^{-1}}\mathbf{J}(z)$, where $g \in G$ and $z \in T^*Q$. Then we know that σ produces a new affine action $\Theta : G \times \mathfrak{g}^* \to \mathfrak{g}^*$ defined by $\Theta(g, \mu) := \mathrm{Ad}^*_{g^{-1}}\mu + \sigma(g)$, where $\mu \in \mathfrak{g}^*$, with respect to which the given momentum map $\mathbf{J}$ is equivariant. Assume that G acts freely and properly on T^*Q, and $\tilde{G}_\mu$ denotes the isotropy subgroup of $\mu \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ relative to this affine action Θ and μ is a regular value of $\mathbf{J}$. Then the quotient space $(T^*Q)_\mu = \mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu)/\tilde{G}_\mu$ is also a symplectic manifold with symplectic form ω_μ uniquely characterized by* (5.1)*, see Ortega and Ratiu [35].*

Assume that $H : T^*Q \to \mathbb{R}$ is a G-invariant Hamiltonian, and the $\mathcal{D}$-completely and $\mathcal{D}$-regularly nonholonomic constraints $\mathcal{D} \subset TQ$ is a G-invariant distribution. From §2, in the same way given by Bates and Śniatycki in [3], by using the Legendre transformation $\mathcal{F}L : TQ \to T^*Q$, we can define the constraint submanifold $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{F}L(\mathcal{D}) \subset T^*Q$ and the distribution $\mathcal{F}$ which is the pre-image of the nonholonomic constraints $\mathcal{D}$ for the map $T\pi_Q : TT^*Q \to TQ$, that is, $\mathcal{F} = (T\pi_Q)^{-1}(\mathcal{D})$, and $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{F} \cap T\mathcal{M}$. Moreover, we can also define the distributional two-form $\omega_\mathcal{K}$, a vector field $X_\mathcal{K}$ and $\mathbf{d}H_\mathcal{K}$, such that $\mathbf{i}_{X_\mathcal{K}}\omega_\mathcal{K} = \mathbf{d}H_\mathcal{K}$. Since $\mathcal{D} \subset TQ$ is a G-invariant distribution, and the Legendre transformation $\mathcal{F}L : TQ \to T^*Q$ is a fiber-preserving map, then $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{F}L(\mathcal{D}) \subset T^*Q$ is G-invariant. For a regular value $\mu \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ of the momentum map $\mathbf{J} : T^*Q \to \mathfrak{g}^*$, we shall assume that $\mathcal{M} \cap \mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu) \neq \emptyset$. Note that $\mathcal{M}$ is also $G_\mu(\subset G)$ action invariant, and so is $\mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu)$, because $\mathbf{J}$ is Ad^*-equivariant. It follows that the quotient space $\mathcal{M}_\mu = (\mathcal{M} \cap \mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu))/G_\mu \subset (T^*Q)_\mu$, which is the G_μ-orbit in $\mathcal{M} \cap \mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu)$, is a smooth manifold with projection $\pi_\mu : \mathcal{M} \cap \mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu) \to \mathcal{M}_\mu$ which is a surjective submersion. Denote by $i_{\mathcal{M}_\mu} : \mathcal{M}_\mu \to (T^*Q)_\mu$, and $\omega_{\mathcal{M}_\mu} = i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu}\omega_\mu$, that is, the symplectic form $\omega_{\mathcal{M}_\mu}$ is induced from the reduced symplectic form ω_μ on $(T^*Q)_\mu$, where $i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu} : T^*(T^*Q)_\mu \to T^*\mathcal{M}_\mu$. Moreover, the distribution $\mathcal{F}$ pushes down to a distribution $\mathcal{F}_\mu = T\pi_\mu \cdot \mathcal{F}$ on $(T^*Q)_\mu$, and we define $\mathcal{K}_\mu = \mathcal{F}_\mu \cap T\mathcal{M}_\mu$. Assume that $\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} = \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot \omega_{\mathcal{M}_\mu}$ is the restriction of the symplectic form $\omega_{\mathcal{M}_\mu}$ on $T^*\mathcal{M}_\mu$ fibrewise to the distribution $\mathcal{K}_\mu$ of the reduced constraint submanifold $\mathcal{M}_\mu$, where $\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}$ is the restriction map to distribution $\mathcal{K}_\mu$. From the construction and the result in Bates and Śniatycki [3], we know that $\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}$ is non-degenerate, and we call $\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}$ as a reduced distributional two-form to avoid any confusion. Because $\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}$ is non-degenerate as a bilinear form on each fibre of $\mathcal{K}_\mu$, there exists a vector field $X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}$ on $\mathcal{M}_\mu$, which takes values in the constraint distribution $\mathcal{K}_\mu$, such that the reduced distributional Hamiltonian equation holds, that is, $\mathbf{i}_{X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}}\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} = \mathbf{d}h_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}$, if the admissibility condition $\mathrm{dim}\mathcal{M}_\mu = \mathrm{rank}\mathcal{F}_\mu$ and the compatibility condition $T\mathcal{M}_\mu \cap \mathcal{F}_\mu^\perp = \{0\}$ hold, where $\mathcal{F}_\mu^\perp$ denotes the symplectic orthogonal of $\mathcal{F}_\mu$ with respect to the reduced symplectic form ω_μ, and $\mathbf{d}h_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}$ is the restriction of $\mathbf{d}h_{\mathcal{M}_\mu}$ to $\mathcal{K}_\mu$, and $h_{\mathcal{M}_\mu} = \tau_{\mathcal{M}_\mu} \cdot h$ is the restriction of h to $\mathcal{M}_\mu$, and h is the reduced Hamiltonian function $h : (T^*Q)_\mu \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by $h \cdot \pi_\mu = H \cdot i_\mu$. Thus, the geometrical formulation of the $\mathbf{J}$-nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system may be summarized as follows.

Definition 5.2 *($\mathbf{J}$-Nonholonomic Reduced Distributional Hamiltonian System) Assume that the 6-tuple $(T^*Q, G, \omega, \mathbf{J}, \mathcal{D}, H)$ is a $\mathcal{D}$-completely and $\mathcal{D}$-regularly nonholonomic Hamiltonian system with symmetry and momentum map, where $\mathcal{D} \subset TQ$ is a $\mathcal{D}$-completely and $\mathcal{D}$-regularly nonholonomic constraint of the system, and $\mathcal{D}$ and H are both G-invariant. For a regular value $\mu \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ of the momentum map $\mathbf{J} : T^*Q \to \mathfrak{g}^*$, assume that there exists a distribution $\mathcal{K}_\mu$, a non-degenerate reduced distributional two-form $\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}$ and a vector field $X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}$ on the reduced constraint submanifold $\mathcal{M}_\mu = (\mathcal{M} \cap \mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu))/G_\mu$, where $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{F}L(\mathcal{D})$, and $\mathcal{M} \cap \mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu) \neq \emptyset$, and $G_\mu = \{g \in G \mid \operatorname{Ad}_g^* \mu = \mu\}$, such that the $\mathbf{J}$-nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian equation $\mathbf{i}_{X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}} \omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} = \mathbf{d}h_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}$ holds, where $\mathbf{d}h_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}$ is the restriction of $\mathbf{d}h_{\mathcal{M}_\mu}$ to $\mathcal{K}_\mu$, and $h_{\mathcal{M}_\mu} = \tau_{\mathcal{M}_\mu} \cdot h$ is the restriction of h to $\mathcal{M}_\mu$, and h is the reduced Hamiltonian function $h : (T^*Q)_\mu \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by $h \cdot \pi_\mu = H \cdot i_\mu$. Then the triple $(\mathcal{K}_\mu, \omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}, h)$ is called a $\mathbf{J}$-nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system of the nonholonomic Hamiltonian system with symmetry and momentum map $(T^*Q, G, \omega, \mathbf{J}, \mathcal{D}, H)$, and $X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}$ is called a $\mathbf{J}$-nonholonomic reduced vector field, which is the dynamical vector field of the $\mathbf{J}$-nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system $(\mathcal{K}_\mu, \omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}, h)$. Under the above circumstances, we refer to $(T^*Q, G, \omega, \mathbf{J}, \mathcal{D}, H)$ as a $\mathbf{J}$-nonholonomic reducible Hamiltonian system with an associated $\mathbf{J}$-nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system $(\mathcal{K}_\mu, \omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}, h)$.*

Given a $\mathbf{J}$-nonholonomic reducible Hamiltonian system with symmetry and momentum map $(T^*Q, G, \omega, \mathbf{J}, \mathcal{D}, H)$ with an associated $\mathbf{J}$-nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system $(\mathcal{K}_\mu, \omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}, h)$, and using the non-degenerate reduced distributional two-form $\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}$ and the $\mathbf{J}$-nonholonomic reduced dynamical vector field $X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}$, we can prove the following two types of Hamilton-Jacobi theorem for the $\mathbf{J}$-nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system $(\mathcal{K}_\mu, \omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}, h)$. At first, by using the fact that the one-form $\gamma : Q \to T^*Q$ is closed on $\mathcal{D}$ with respect to $T\pi_Q : TT^*Q \to TQ$, we can prove the Type I of geometric Hamilton-Jacobi theorem for the $\mathbf{J}$-nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system. For convenience, the maps involved in the following theorem and its proof are shown in Diagram-5.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu) \arrow[r, "i_\mu"] & T^*Q \arrow[r, "\pi_Q"] & Q \arrow[r, "\gamma"] \arrow[d, "X_H^\gamma"'] & T^*Q \arrow[r, "\pi_\mu"] \arrow[d, "X_H"'] & (T^*Q)_\mu \arrow[d, "X_{h_\mu}"'] & \mathcal{M}_\mu \arrow[l, "i_{\mathcal{M}_\mu}"'] \arrow[d, "X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}"'] \\
& T(T^*Q) & TQ \arrow[l, "T\gamma"'] & T(T^*Q) \arrow[l, "T\pi_Q"] \arrow[r, "T\pi_\mu"'] & T(T^*Q)_\mu \arrow[r, "\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}"] & \mathcal{K}_\mu
\end{tikzcd}$$

Diagram-5

Theorem 5.3 *(Type I of Hamilton-Jacobi Theorem for a $\mathbf{J}$-nonholonomic Reduced Distributional Hamiltonian System) For the $\mathbf{J}$-nonholonomic reducible Hamiltonian system $(T^*Q, G, \omega, \mathbf{J}, \mathcal{D}, H)$ with an associated $\mathbf{J}$-nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system $(\mathcal{K}_\mu, \omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}, h)$, assume that $\gamma : Q \to T^*Q$ is an one-form on Q, and $X_H^\gamma = T\pi_Q \cdot X_H \cdot \gamma$, where X_H is the dynamical vector field of the corresponding unconstrained Hamiltonian system with symmetry and momentum map $(T^*Q, G, \omega, \mathbf{J}, H)$. Moreover, assume that $\mu \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ is a regular value of the momentum map $\mathbf{J}$, and $Im(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{M} \cap \mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu)$, and that it is G_μ-invariant, and $\bar{\gamma}_\mu = \pi_\mu(\gamma) : Q \to \mathcal{M}_\mu$, and $Im(T\bar{\gamma}_\mu) \subset \mathcal{K}_\mu$. If the one-form $\gamma : Q \to T^*Q$ is closed on $\mathcal{D}$ with respect to $T\pi_Q : TT^*Q \to TQ$, then $\bar{\gamma}_\mu$ is a solution of the equation $T\bar{\gamma}_\mu \cdot X_H^\gamma = X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot \bar{\gamma}_\mu$. Here $X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}$ is the dynamical vector field of the $\mathbf{J}$-nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system $(\mathcal{K}_\mu, \omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}, h)$. The equation $T\bar{\gamma}_\mu \cdot X_H^\gamma = X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot \bar{\gamma}_\mu$, is called the Type I of Hamilton-Jacobi equation for the $\mathbf{J}$-nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system $(\mathcal{K}_\mu, \omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}, h)$.*

Proof: At first, from Theorem 3.4, we know that γ is a solution of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation $T\gamma \cdot X_H^\gamma = X_\mathcal{K} \cdot \gamma$. Next, we note that $\mathrm{Im}(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{M} \cap \mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu)$, and $\mathrm{Im}(T\bar{\gamma}_\mu) \subset \mathcal{K}_\mu$, in this case, $\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} = \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot \omega_{\mathcal{M}_\mu} = \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu} \cdot \omega_\mu$, along $\mathrm{Im}(T\bar{\gamma}_\mu)$, and $\pi_\mu^*\omega_\mu = i_\mu^*\omega = \omega$, along $\mathrm{Im}(\gamma)$. Thus, using the **J**-nonholonomic reduced distributional two-form $\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}$, from Lemma 3.3, if we take that $v = \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot T\pi_\mu \cdot X_H \cdot \gamma = X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot \bar{\gamma}_\mu \in \mathcal{K}_\mu$, and for any $w \in \mathcal{F}$, $T\lambda(w) \neq 0$, and $\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot T\pi_\mu \cdot w \neq 0$, then we have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}(T\bar{\gamma}_\mu \cdot X_H^\gamma,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot T\pi_\mu \cdot w) = \omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}(\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot T\bar{\gamma}_\mu \cdot X_H^\gamma,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot T\pi_\mu \cdot w) \\
&= \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot \omega_{\mathcal{M}_\mu}(T(\pi_\mu \cdot \gamma) \cdot X_H^\gamma,\ T\pi_\mu \cdot w) = \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu} \cdot \omega_\mu(T\pi_\mu \cdot T\gamma \cdot X_H^\gamma,\ T\pi_\mu \cdot w) \\
&= \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu} \cdot \pi_\mu^*\omega_\mu(T\gamma \cdot T\pi_Q \cdot X_H \cdot \gamma,\ w) = \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu} \cdot \omega(T(\gamma \cdot \pi_Q) \cdot X_H \cdot \gamma,\ w) \\
&= \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu} \cdot (\omega(X_H \cdot \gamma,\ w - T(\gamma \cdot \pi_Q) \cdot w) - \mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(X_H \cdot \gamma),\ T\pi_Q(w))) \\
&= \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu} \cdot \pi_\mu^*\omega_\mu(X_H \cdot \gamma,\ w) - \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu} \cdot \pi_\mu^*\omega_\mu(X_H \cdot \gamma,\ T(\gamma \cdot \pi_Q) \cdot w) \\
&\quad - \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu} \cdot \mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(X_H \cdot \gamma),\ T\pi_Q(w)) \\
&= \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu} \cdot \omega_\mu(T\pi_\mu(X_H \cdot \gamma),\ T\pi_\mu \cdot w) - \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu} \cdot \omega_\mu(T\pi_\mu \cdot (X_H \cdot \gamma),\ T(\pi_\mu \cdot \gamma) \cdot T\pi_Q(w)) \\
&\quad - \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu} \cdot \mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(X_H \cdot \gamma),\ T\pi_Q(w)) \\
&= \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu} \cdot \omega_\mu(X_h \cdot \bar{\gamma}_\mu,\ T\pi_\mu \cdot w) - \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu} \cdot \omega_\mu(X_h \cdot \bar{\gamma}_\mu,\ T\bar{\gamma}_\mu \cdot T\pi_Q(w)) \\
&\quad - \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu} \cdot \mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(X_H \cdot \gamma),\ T\pi_Q(w)) \\
&= \omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}(\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot X_h \cdot \bar{\gamma}_\mu,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot T\pi_\mu \cdot w) - \omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}(\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot X_h \cdot \bar{\gamma}_\mu,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot T\bar{\gamma}_\mu \cdot T\pi_Q(w)) \\
&\quad - \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu} \cdot \mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(X_H \cdot \gamma),\ T\pi_Q(w)) \\
&= \omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}(X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot \bar{\gamma}_\mu,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot T\pi_\mu \cdot w) - \omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}(X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot \bar{\gamma}_\mu,\ T\bar{\gamma}_\mu \cdot T\pi_Q(w)) \\
&\quad - \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu} \cdot \mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(X_H \cdot \gamma),\ T\pi_Q(w)),
\end{aligned}
$$

where we have used that $\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot T\bar{\gamma}_\mu = T\bar{\gamma}_\mu$, and $\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot X_h \cdot \bar{\gamma}_\mu = X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot \bar{\gamma}_\mu$, since $\mathrm{Im}(T\bar{\gamma}_\mu) \subset \mathcal{K}_\mu$. If the one-form $\gamma : Q \rightarrow T^*Q$ is closed on $\mathcal{D}$ with respect to $T\pi_Q : TT^*Q \rightarrow TQ$, then we have that $\mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(X_H \cdot \gamma),\ T\pi_Q(w)) = 0$, since $X_H \cdot \gamma,\ w \in \mathcal{F}$, and $T\pi_Q(X_H \cdot \gamma),\ T\pi_Q(w) \in \mathcal{D}$, and hence

$$\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu} \cdot \mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(X_H \cdot \gamma),\ T\pi_Q(w)) = 0,$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}(T\bar{\gamma}_\mu \cdot X_H^\gamma,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot T\pi_\mu \cdot w) - \omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}(X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot \bar{\gamma}_\mu,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot T\pi_\mu \cdot w) \\
&= -\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}(X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot \bar{\gamma}_\mu,\ T\bar{\gamma}_\mu \cdot T\pi_Q(w)).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.2}
$$

If $\bar{\gamma}_\mu$ satisfies the equation $T\bar{\gamma}_\mu \cdot X_H^\gamma = X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot \bar{\gamma}_\mu$, from Lemma 3.3(i) we know that the right side of (5.2) becomes

$$
\begin{aligned}
-\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}(X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot \bar{\gamma}_\mu,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot T\bar{\gamma}_\mu \cdot T\pi_Q(w)) &= -\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}(T\bar{\gamma}_\mu \cdot X_H^\gamma,\ T\bar{\gamma}_\mu \cdot T\pi_Q(w)) \\
&= -\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}(\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} T\bar{\gamma}_\mu \cdot X_H^\gamma,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot T\bar{\gamma}_\mu \cdot T\pi_Q(w)) \\
&= -\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu} \cdot \omega_\mu(T\bar{\gamma}_\mu \cdot X_H^\gamma,\ T\bar{\gamma}_\mu \cdot T\pi_Q(w)) \\
&= -\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu} \cdot \bar{\gamma}_\mu^* \cdot \omega_\mu(T\pi_Q \cdot X_H \cdot \gamma,\ T\pi_Q(w)) \\
&= -\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu} \cdot \gamma^* \cdot \pi_\mu^* \cdot \omega_\mu(T\pi_Q \cdot X_H \cdot \gamma,\ T\pi_Q(w)) \\
&= -\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu} \cdot \gamma^*\omega(T\pi_Q(X_H \cdot \gamma),\ T\pi_Q(w)) \\
&= \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu} \cdot \mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(X_H \cdot \gamma),\ T\pi_Q(w)) = 0.
\end{aligned}
$$

But, because the **J**-nonholonomic reduced distributional two-form $\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}$ is non-degenerate, the left side of (5.2) equals zero, only when $\bar{\gamma}_\mu$ satisfies the equation $T\bar{\gamma}_\mu \cdot X_H^\gamma = X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot \bar{\gamma}_\mu$. Thus, if the one-form $\gamma : Q \to T^*Q$ is closed on $\mathcal{D}$ with respect to $T\pi_Q : TT^*Q \to TQ$, then $\bar{\gamma}_\mu$ must be a solution of the Type I of Hamilton-Jacobi equation $T\bar{\gamma}_\mu \cdot X_H^\gamma = X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot \bar{\gamma}_\mu$. ■

Next, for any G_μ-invariant symplectic map $\varepsilon : T^*Q \to T^*Q$, we can prove the following Type II of geometric Hamilton-Jacobi theorem for the **J**-nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system. For convenience, the maps involved in the following theorem and its proof are shown in Diagram-6.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu) \arrow[r, "i_\mu"] & T^*Q \arrow[r, "\pi_Q"] \arrow[d, "X_{H\cdot\varepsilon}"'] \arrow[dr, "X_H^\varepsilon"] & Q \arrow[r, "\gamma"] & T^*Q \arrow[r, "\pi_\mu"] \arrow[d, "X_H"'] \arrow[dr, "X_{h_\mu}\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}"] & (T^*Q)_\mu \arrow[d, "X_{h_\mu}"] & \mathcal{M}_\mu \arrow[l, "i_{\mathcal{M}_\mu}"'] \arrow[d, "X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}"'] \\
 & T(T^*Q) & TQ \arrow[l, "T\gamma"] & T(T^*Q) \arrow[l, "T\pi_Q"] \arrow[r, "T\pi_\mu"'] & T(T^*Q)_\mu \arrow[r, "\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}"] & \mathcal{K}_\mu
\end{tikzcd}$$

Diagram-6

Theorem 5.4 *(Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi Theorem for a* **J***-nonholonomic Reduced Distributional Hamiltonian System) For the* **J***-nonholonomic reducible Hamiltonian system* $(T^*Q, G, \omega, \mathbf{J}, \mathcal{D}, H)$ *with an associated* **J***-nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system* $(\mathcal{K}_\mu, \omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}, h)$*, assume that* $\gamma : Q \to T^*Q$ *is an one-form on* Q*, and* $\lambda = \gamma \cdot \pi_Q : T^*Q \to T^*Q$*, and for any symplectic map* $\varepsilon : T^*Q \to T^*Q$*, denote by* $X_H^\varepsilon = T\pi_Q \cdot X_H \cdot \varepsilon$*, where* X_H *is the dynamical vector field of the corresponding unconstrained Hamiltonian system with symmetry and momentum map* $(T^*Q, G, \omega, \mathbf{J}, H)$*. Moreover, assume that* $\mu \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ *is a regular value of the momentum map* **J***, and Im*$(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{M} \cap \mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu)$*, and that it is* G_μ*-invariant, and* ε *is* G_μ*-invariant and* $\varepsilon(\mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu)) \subset \mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu)$*. Denote by* $\bar{\gamma}_\mu = \pi_\mu(\gamma) : Q \to \mathcal{M}_\mu$*, and Im*$(T\bar{\gamma}_\mu) \subset \mathcal{K}_\mu$*, and* $\bar{\lambda}_\mu = \pi_\mu(\lambda) : \mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu)(\subset T^*Q) \to \mathcal{M}_\mu$*, and* $\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu = \pi_\mu(\varepsilon) : \mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu)(\subset T^*Q) \to \mathcal{M}_\mu$*. Then* ε *and* $\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu$ *satisfy the equation* $\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot T\bar{\varepsilon}(X_{h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu}) = T\bar{\lambda}_\mu \cdot X_H \cdot \varepsilon$*, if and only if they satisfy the equation* $T\bar{\gamma}_\mu \cdot X_H^\varepsilon = X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot \bar{\varepsilon}_\mu$*. Here* $X_{h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu}$ *is the Hamiltonian vector field of the function* $h \cdot \bar{\varepsilon}_\mu : T^*Q \to \mathbb{R}$*, and* $X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}$ *is the dynamical vector field of the* **J***-nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system* $(\mathcal{K}_\mu, \omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}, h)$*. The equation* $T\bar{\gamma}_\mu \cdot X_H^\varepsilon = X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot \bar{\varepsilon}_\mu$*, is called the Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi equation for the* **J***-nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system* $(\mathcal{K}_\mu, \omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}, h)$*.*

Proof: At first, we note that Im$(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{M} \cap \mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu)$, and Im$(T\bar{\gamma}_\mu) \subset \mathcal{K}_\mu$, in this case, $\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} = \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot \omega_{\mathcal{M}_\mu} = \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu} \cdot \omega_\mu$, along Im$(T\bar{\gamma}_\mu)$, and $\pi^*_\mu \omega_\mu = i^*_\mu \omega = \omega$, along Im$(\gamma)$. Thus, using the **J**-nonholonomic reduced distributional two-form $\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}$, from Lemma 3.3, if we take that $v = \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot T\pi_\mu \cdot X_H \cdot \varepsilon = X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot \bar{\varepsilon}_\mu \in \mathcal{K}_\mu$, and for any $w \in \mathcal{F}$, $T\lambda(w) \neq 0$, and $\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot T\pi_\mu \cdot w \neq 0$, then we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}(T\bar{\gamma}_\mu\cdot X_H^\varepsilon,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot T\pi_\mu\cdot w)=\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}(\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot T\bar{\gamma}_\mu\cdot X_H^\varepsilon,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot T\pi_\mu\cdot w)\\
&=\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot\omega_{\mathcal{M}_\mu}(T(\pi_\mu\cdot\gamma)\cdot X_H^\varepsilon,\ T\pi_\mu\cdot w)=\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu}\cdot\omega_\mu(T\pi_\mu\cdot T\gamma\cdot X_H^\varepsilon,\ T\pi_\mu\cdot w)\\
&=\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu}\cdot\pi_\mu^*\omega_\mu(T\gamma\cdot T\pi_Q\cdot X_H\cdot\varepsilon,\ w)=\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu}\cdot\omega(T(\gamma\cdot\pi_Q)\cdot X_H\cdot\varepsilon,\ w)\\
&=\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu}\cdot(\omega(X_H\cdot\varepsilon,\ w-T(\gamma\cdot\pi_Q)\cdot w)-\mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(X_H\cdot\varepsilon),\ T\pi_Q(w)))\\
&=\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu}\cdot\omega(X_H\cdot\varepsilon,\ w)-\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu}\cdot\omega(X_H\cdot\varepsilon,\ T\lambda\cdot w)\\
&\quad-\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu}\cdot\mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(X_H\cdot\varepsilon),\ T\pi_Q(w))\\
&=\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu}\cdot\pi_\mu^*\omega_\mu(X_H\cdot\varepsilon,\ w)-\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu}\cdot\pi_\mu^*\omega_\mu(X_H\cdot\varepsilon,\ T\lambda\cdot w)\\
&\quad+\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu}\cdot\lambda^*\omega(X_H\cdot\varepsilon,\ w)\\
&=\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu}\cdot\omega_\mu(T\pi_\mu(X_H\cdot\varepsilon),\ T\pi_\mu\cdot w)-\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu}\cdot\omega_\mu(T\pi_\mu\cdot(X_H\cdot\varepsilon),\ T(\pi_\mu\cdot\lambda)\cdot w)\\
&\quad+\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu}\cdot\pi_\mu^*\omega_\mu(T\lambda\cdot X_H\cdot\varepsilon,\ T\lambda\cdot w)\\
&=\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu}\cdot\omega_\mu(T\pi_\mu(X_H)\cdot\pi_\mu(\varepsilon),\ T\pi_\mu\cdot w)-\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu}\cdot\omega_\mu(T\pi_\mu(X_H)\cdot\pi_\mu(\varepsilon),\ T\bar{\lambda}_\mu\cdot w)\\
&\quad+\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu}\cdot\omega_\mu(T\pi_\mu\cdot T\lambda\cdot X_H\cdot\varepsilon,\ T\pi_\mu\cdot T\lambda\cdot w)\\
&=\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu}\cdot\omega_\mu(X_h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu,\ T\pi_\mu\cdot w)-\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu}\cdot\omega_\mu(X_h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu,\ T\bar{\lambda}_\mu\cdot w)\\
&\quad+\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu}\cdot\omega_\mu(T\bar{\lambda}_\mu\cdot X_H\cdot\varepsilon,\ T\bar{\lambda}_\mu\cdot w)\\
&=\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}(\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot X_h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot T\pi_\mu\cdot w)-\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}(\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot X_h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot T\bar{\lambda}_\mu\cdot w)\\
&\quad+\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}(\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot T\bar{\lambda}_\mu\cdot X_H\cdot\varepsilon,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot T\bar{\lambda}_\mu\cdot w)\\
&=\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}(X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot T\pi_\mu\cdot w)-\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}(\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot X_h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu,\ T\bar{\lambda}_\mu\cdot w)\\
&\quad+\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}(T\bar{\lambda}_\mu\cdot X_H\cdot\varepsilon,\ T\bar{\lambda}_\mu\cdot w),
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot T\bar{\gamma}_\mu=T\bar{\gamma}_\mu$, and $\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot X_h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu=X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu$, since $\mathrm{Im}(T\bar{\gamma}_\mu)\subset\mathcal{K}_\mu$. Note that $\varepsilon:T^*Q\to T^*Q$ is symplectic, and $\pi_\mu^*\omega_\mu=i_\mu^*\omega=\omega$, along $\mathrm{Im}(\gamma)$, and hence $\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu=\pi_\mu(\varepsilon):T^*Q\to(T^*Q)_\mu$ is also symplectic along $\mathrm{Im}(\gamma)$, and hence $X_h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu=T\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu\cdot X_{h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu}$, along $\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu$, and hence $\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot X_h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu=\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot T\bar{\lambda}_\mu\cdot X_{h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu}$, along $\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu$, because $\mathrm{Im}(T\bar{\gamma}_\mu)\subset\mathcal{K}_\mu$. Then we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}(T\bar{\gamma}_\mu\cdot X_H^\varepsilon,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot T\pi_\mu\cdot w)-\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}(X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot T\pi_\mu\cdot w)\\
&=-\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}(\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot X_h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu,\ T\bar{\lambda}_\mu\cdot w)+\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}(T\bar{\lambda}_\mu\cdot X_H\cdot\varepsilon,\ T\bar{\lambda}_\mu\cdot w)\\
&=\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}(T\bar{\lambda}_\mu\cdot X_H\cdot\varepsilon-\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot T\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu\cdot X_{h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu},\ T\bar{\lambda}_\mu\cdot w).
\end{aligned}$$

Because the distributional two-form $\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}$ is non-degenerate, it follows that the equation $T\bar{\gamma}_\mu\cdot X_H^\varepsilon=X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu$, is equivalent to the equation $T\bar{\lambda}_\mu\cdot X_H\cdot\varepsilon=\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot T\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu\cdot X_{h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu}$. Thus, ε and $\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu$ satisfy the equation $T\bar{\lambda}_\mu\cdot X_H\cdot\varepsilon=\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot T\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu\cdot X_{h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu}$, if and only if they satisfy the Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi equation $T\bar{\gamma}_\mu\cdot X_H^\varepsilon=X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu$. ■

Remark 5.5 *If the reducible Hamiltonian system we considered has not any constrains, in this case, the* **J***-nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system is just the regular point reduced Hamiltonian system itself. From the above Type I and Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi theorems, that is, Theorem* 5.3 *and Theorem* 5.4*, we can get the Theorem* 3.3 *and Theorem* 3.4 *in Wang [43]. It shows that Theorem* 5.3 *and Theorem* 5.4 *are the generalization of two types of geometric Hamilton-Jacobi theorem for the regular point reducible Hamiltonian system given in [43] to the nonholonomic context.*

Remark 5.6 *It is worthy of note that, in general, the dynamical vector field of the* $\mathbf{J}$*-nonholonomic reducible Hamiltonian system may not be Hamiltonian, and the* $\mathbf{J}$*-nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system is not yet a Hamiltonian system, and hence we can not describe the Hamilton-Jacobi equation for a* $\mathbf{J}$*-nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system from the viewpoint of generating function as in the classical case. Thus, the formulations of Type I and Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi equation for a* $\mathbf{J}$*-nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system, given by Theorem 5.3 and Theorem 5.4, have more extensive sense. On the other hand, if* γ *is a solution of the classical Hamilton-Jacobi equation, that is,* $X_H \cdot \gamma = 0$*, then* $X_H^\gamma = T\pi_Q \cdot X_H \cdot \gamma = 0$*, and hence from the Type I of Hamilton-Jacobi equation, we have that* $X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot \bar{\gamma}_\mu = T\bar{\gamma}_\mu \cdot X_H^\gamma = 0$*. Because the classical Hamilton-Jacobi equation* $X_H \cdot \gamma = 0$*, shows that the dynamical vector field of the corresponding unconstrained Hamiltonian system* (T^*Q, ω, H) *is degenerate along* γ*, then the equation* $X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot \bar{\gamma}_\mu = 0$*, shows that the dynamical vector field of the* $\mathbf{J}$*-nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system* $(\mathcal{K}_\mu, \omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}, h)$ *is degenerate along* $\bar{\gamma}_\mu$*. The equation* $X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot \bar{\gamma}_\mu = 0$ *is called the classical Hamilton-Jacobi equation for the* $\mathbf{J}$*-nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system* $(\mathcal{K}_\mu, \omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}, h)$*. In addition, for a symplectic map* $\varepsilon : T^*Q \to T^*Q$*, if* $X_H \cdot \varepsilon = 0$*, then from the Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi equation, we have that* $X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot \bar{\varepsilon}_\mu = T\bar{\gamma}_\mu \cdot X_H^\varepsilon = 0$*. But, from the equation* $T\bar{\lambda}_\mu \cdot X_H \cdot \varepsilon = \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot T\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu \cdot X_{h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu}$*, we know that the equation* $X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot \bar{\varepsilon}_\mu = 0$ *is not equivalent to the equation* $X_{h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu} = 0$*.*

Remark 5.7 *If* (T^*Q, ω) *is a connected symplectic manifold, and* $\mathbf{J} : T^*Q \to \mathfrak{g}^*$ *is a non-equivariant momentum map with a non-equivariance group one-cocycle* $\sigma : G \to \mathfrak{g}^*$*, in this case, we can also define the* $\mathbf{J}$*-nonholonomic reducible Hamiltonian system* $(T^*Q, G, \omega, \mathbf{J}, \mathcal{D}, H)$ *with an associated* $\mathbf{J}$*-nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system* $(\mathcal{K}_\mu, \omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}, h)$*, and prove the Type I and Type II of the Hamilton-Jacobi theorem for the* $\mathbf{J}$*-nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system* $(\mathcal{K}_\mu, \omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}, h)$ *by using a similar way as above, in which the reduced space* $((T^*Q)_\mu, \omega_\mu)$ *is determined by the affine action given in Remark 5.1.*

For the $\mathbf{J}$-nonholonomic reducible Hamiltonian system $(T^*Q, G, \omega, \mathbf{J}, \mathcal{D}, H)$ with an associated $\mathbf{J}$- nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system $(\mathcal{K}_\mu, \omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}, h)$, we know that the dynamical vector fields X_H and X_h are π_μ-related, that is, $X_h \cdot \pi_\mu = T\pi_\mu \cdot X_H \cdot i_\mu$. Then we can prove the following Theorem 5.8, which states the relationship between the solutions of Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi equations and $\mathbf{J}$-nonholonomic reduction.

Theorem 5.8 *For the* $\mathbf{J}$*-nonholonomic reducible Hamiltonian system* $(T^*Q, G, \omega, \mathbf{J}, \mathcal{D}, H)$ *with an associated* $\mathbf{J}$*-nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system* $(\mathcal{K}_\mu, \omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}, h)$*, assume that* $\gamma : Q \to T^*Q$ *is an one-form on* Q*, and* $\lambda = \gamma \cdot \pi_Q : T^*Q \to T^*Q$*, and* $\varepsilon : T^*Q \to T^*Q$ *is a symplectic map. Moreover, assume that* $\mu \in \mathfrak{g}^*$ *is a regular value of the momentum map* $\mathbf{J}$*, and Im*$(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{M} \cap \mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu)$*, and that it is* G_μ*-invariant, and* ε *is* G_μ*-invariant and* $\varepsilon(\mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu)) \subset \mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu)$*. Denote by* $\bar{\gamma}_\mu = \pi_\mu(\gamma) : Q \to \mathcal{M}_\mu$*, and Im*$(T\bar{\gamma}_\mu) \subset \mathcal{K}_\mu$*, and* $\bar{\lambda}_\mu = \pi_\mu(\lambda) : \mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu) (\subset T^*Q) \to (T^*Q)_\mu$*, and* $\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu = \pi_\mu(\varepsilon) : \mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu) (\subset T^*Q) \to (T^*Q)_\mu$*. Then* ε *is a solution of the Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi equation* $T\gamma \cdot X_H^\varepsilon = X_{\mathcal{K}} \cdot \varepsilon$*, for the distributional Hamiltonian system* $(\mathcal{K}, \omega_{\mathcal{K}}, H)$*, if and only if* ε *and* $\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu$ *satisfy the Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi equation* $T\bar{\gamma}_\mu \cdot X_H^\varepsilon = X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot \bar{\varepsilon}_\mu$*, for the* $\mathbf{J}$*-nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system* $(\mathcal{K}_\mu, \omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}, h)$*.*

Proof: Note that $\mathrm{Im}(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{M} \cap \mathbf{J}^{-1}(\mu)$, and $\mathrm{Im}(T\bar{\gamma}_\mu) \subset \mathcal{K}_\mu$, in this case, $\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} = \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot \omega_{\mathcal{M}_\mu} = \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu} \cdot \omega_\mu$, along $\mathrm{Im}(T\bar{\gamma}_\mu)$, and $\pi^*_\mu \omega_\mu = i^*_\mu \omega = \omega$, along $\mathrm{Im}(\gamma)$, and $\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot T\bar{\gamma}_\mu = T\bar{\gamma}_\mu$, and $\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu} \cdot X_h = X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}$. Since the dynamical vector fields X_H and X_h are π_μ-related, that is, $X_h \cdot \pi_\mu = T\pi_\mu \cdot X_H \cdot i_\mu$, using the $\mathbf{J}$-nonholonomic reduced distributional two-form $\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}(T\bar{\gamma}_\mu \cdot X_H^\varepsilon - X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot \bar{\varepsilon}_\mu,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot T\pi_\mu \cdot w)\\
&= \omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}(T\bar{\gamma}_\mu \cdot X_H^\varepsilon,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot T\pi_\mu \cdot w) - \omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}(X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot \bar{\varepsilon}_\mu,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot T\pi_\mu \cdot w)\\
&= \omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}(\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot T\bar{\gamma}_\mu \cdot X_H^\varepsilon,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot T\pi_\mu \cdot w) - \omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}(\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot X_h\cdot \pi_\mu\cdot\varepsilon,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot T\pi_\mu \cdot w)\\
&= \omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}(T\pi_\mu\cdot T\gamma \cdot X_H^\varepsilon,\ T\pi_\mu \cdot w) - \omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}(T\pi_\mu\cdot X_H\cdot\varepsilon,\ T\pi_\mu \cdot w)\\
&= \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu}\cdot\omega_\mu(T\pi_\mu\cdot T\gamma \cdot X_H^\varepsilon,\ T\pi_\mu \cdot w) - \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu}\cdot\omega_\mu(T\pi_\mu\cdot X_H\cdot\varepsilon,\ T\pi_\mu \cdot w)\\
&= \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu}\cdot\pi_\mu^*\omega_\mu(T\gamma \cdot X_H^\varepsilon,\ w) - \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu}\cdot\pi_\mu^*\omega_\mu(X_H\cdot\varepsilon,\ w)\\
&= \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu}\cdot\omega(T\gamma \cdot X_H^\varepsilon,\ w) - \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu}\cdot\omega(X_H\cdot\varepsilon,\ w).
\end{aligned}$$

In the case we considered, $\tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}_\mu}\cdot\omega = \tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot i^*_{\mathcal{M}}\cdot\omega = \omega_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot\tau_{\mathcal{K}}$, and $\tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot T\gamma = T\gamma,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot X_H = X_{\mathcal{K}}$, since $\mathrm{Im}(\gamma)\subset\mathcal{M}$, and $\mathrm{Im}(T\gamma)\subset\mathcal{K}$. Thus, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}(T\bar{\gamma}_\mu \cdot X_H^\varepsilon - X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot \bar{\varepsilon}_\mu,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot T\pi_\mu \cdot w)\\
&= \omega_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot\tau_{\mathcal{K}}(T\gamma\cdot X_H^\varepsilon,\ w) - \omega_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot\tau_{\mathcal{K}}(X_H\cdot\varepsilon,\ w)\\
&= \omega_{\mathcal{K}}(\tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot T\gamma\cdot X_H^\varepsilon,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot w) - \omega_{\mathcal{K}}(\tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot X_H\cdot\varepsilon,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot w)\\
&= \omega_{\mathcal{K}}(T\gamma\cdot X_H^\varepsilon,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot w) - \omega_{\mathcal{K}}(X_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot\varepsilon,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot w)\\
&= \omega_{\mathcal{K}}(T\gamma\cdot X_H^\varepsilon - X_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot\varepsilon,\ \tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot w).
\end{aligned}$$

Because the distributional two-form $\omega_{\mathcal{K}}$ and the reduced distributional two-form $\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}$ are non-degenerate, it follows that the equation $T\bar{\gamma}_\mu\cdot X_H^\varepsilon = X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu$, is equivalent to the equation $T\gamma\cdot X_H^\varepsilon = X_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot\varepsilon$. Thus, ε is a solution of the Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi equation $T\gamma\cdot X_H^\varepsilon = X_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot\varepsilon$, for the distributional Hamiltonian system $(\mathcal{K},\omega_{\mathcal{K}},H)$, if and only if ε and $\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu$ satisfy the Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi equation $T\bar{\gamma}_\mu\cdot X_H^\varepsilon = X_{\mathcal{K}_\mu}\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}_\mu$, for the **J**-nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system $(\mathcal{K}_\mu,\omega_{\mathcal{K}_\mu},h)$. ■

6 Applications

In this section, in order to illustrate the Hamilton-Jacobi theory for the nonholonomic reducible Hamiltonian system with symmetry, we shall discuss the following two examples: (1) the motion of constrained particle in space $\mathbb{R}^3$; (2) the motion of vertical rolling disk. These two examples are classical in the theory of nonholonomic mechanical systems. We shall follow the notations and conventions introduced in Bates and Śniatycki [3], Bloch [4], Jotz and Ratiu [16], and Wang [43].

6.1 The constrained particle in $\mathbb{R}^3$

In this subsection, we consider the motion of constrained particle in space $\mathbb{R}^3$, and obtain explicitly the motion equations and the Type I and Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi equations of this problem. The configuration space of motion of the constrained particle in space is $Q=\mathbb{R}^3$, whose coordinates are denoted by $q=(x,y,z)$, its velocity space is $T\mathbb{R}^3$, and the phase space is $T^*\mathbb{R}^3$ with canonical symplectic form $\omega = \mathbf{d}x\wedge\mathbf{d}p_x + \mathbf{d}y\wedge\mathbf{d}p_y + \mathbf{d}z\wedge\mathbf{d}p_z$. The constraints on the velocities are given by

$$\mathcal{D} = \{(x,y,z,v_x,v_y,v_z)\in T\mathbb{R}^3|\ v_z = \sigma(y)v_x\},$$

where $\sigma(y)$ is a smooth function. For any $q\in Q,\ \mathcal{D}(q) = \mathrm{Span}\{\partial_x + \sigma(y)\partial_z,\ \partial_y\}$. Note that

$$[\partial_x + \sigma(y)\partial_z,\ \partial_y] = [\partial_x,\ \partial_y] + [\sigma(y)\partial_z,\ \partial_y] = \sigma'(y)\partial_z,$$

which is nonzero everywhere if $\sigma'(y)\neq 0$, then $\mathcal{D}$ is nonholonomic and it is **completely nonholonomic**, that is, $\mathcal{D}$ along with all of its iterated Lie brackets $[\mathcal{D},\mathcal{D}],[\mathcal{D},[\mathcal{D},\mathcal{D}]],\cdots$ spans the tangent bundle TQ. The Lagrangian $L: T\mathbb{R}^3\to\mathbb{R}$ is the kinetic energy of the Euclidean metric of $\mathbb{R}^3$, that is, $L=\frac{1}{2}(v_x^2+v_y^2+v_z^2)$, which is simple and it is hyperregular, and hence the system is **$\mathcal{D}$-regular** automatically. The momenta are $p_x=\frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{x}}=v_x$, $p_y=\frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{y}}=v_y$, and $p_z=\frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{z}}=v_z=\sigma(y)p_x$, and the Hamiltonian $H: T^*\mathbb{R}^3\to\mathbb{R}$ is given by $H=\frac{1}{2}(p_x^2+p_y^2+p_z^2)$. The unconstrained Hamiltonian vector field is $X_H=p_x\partial_x+p_y\partial_y+p_z\partial_z$. By using the Legendre transformation

$$\mathcal{F}L: T\mathbb{R}^3\to T^*\mathbb{R}^3,\ \mathcal{F}L(x,y,z,v_x,v_y,v_z)=(x,y,z,p_x,p_y,p_z),$$

the constraint submanifold $\mathcal{M}=\mathcal{F}L(\mathcal{D})$ is given by

$$\mathcal{M}=\{(x,y,z,p_x,p_y,p_z)\in T^*Q|\ p_z=\sigma(y)p_x\}.$$

Moreover, define $\mathcal{F}=(T\pi_Q)^{-1}(\mathcal{D})$, and the compatibility condition $T\mathcal{M}\cap\mathcal{F}^{\perp}=\{0\}$ holds, where $\mathcal{F}^{\perp}$ denotes the symplectic orthogonal of $\mathcal{F}$ with respect to the canonical symplectic form ω. Then the distribution

$$\mathcal{K}=\mathcal{F}\cap T\mathcal{M}=\operatorname{span}\{\partial_x+\sigma(y)\partial_z,\partial_y,\partial_{p_x},\partial_{p_y}\}.$$

The induced two-form $\omega_{\mathcal{M}}=i_{\mathcal{M}}^*\cdot\omega$ is given by

$$\omega_{\mathcal{M}}=\mathbf{d}x\wedge\mathbf{d}p_x+\mathbf{d}y\wedge\mathbf{d}p_y+\mathbf{d}z\wedge(p_x\sigma'(y)\mathbf{d}y+\sigma(y)\mathbf{d}p_x),$$

and the non-degenerate distributional two-form is $\omega_{\mathcal{K}}=\tau_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot\omega_{\mathcal{M}}$. A direct computation yields

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{i}_{\partial_x+\sigma(y)\partial_z}\omega_{\mathcal{K}}&=(1+\sigma^2(y))\mathbf{d}p_x+\sigma(y)\sigma'(y)p_x\mathbf{d}y, &\quad \mathbf{i}_{\partial_y}\omega_{\mathcal{K}}&=\mathbf{d}p_y-\sigma'(y)p_x\mathbf{d}z,\\ \mathbf{i}_{\partial_{p_x}}\omega_{\mathcal{K}}&=-\sigma(y)\mathbf{d}z-\mathbf{d}x, & \mathbf{i}_{\partial_{p_y}}\omega_{\mathcal{K}}&=-\mathbf{d}y,\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{d}H_{\mathcal{K}}&=p_x\mathbf{d}p_x+p_y\mathbf{d}p_y+\sigma(y)\sigma'(y)p_x^2\mathbf{d}y+\sigma^2(y)p_x\mathbf{d}p_x\\ &=\sigma(y)\sigma'(y)p_x^2\mathbf{d}y+(1+\sigma^2(y))p_x\mathbf{d}p_x+p_y\mathbf{d}p_y.\end{aligned}$$

Assume that $X_{\mathcal{K}}=X_1(\partial_x+\sigma(y)\partial_z)+X_2\partial_y+X_3\partial_{p_x}+X_4\partial_{p_y}$, then we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{i}_{X_{\mathcal{K}}}\omega_{\mathcal{K}}&=X_1((1+\sigma^2(y))\mathbf{d}p_x+\sigma(y)\sigma'(y)p_x\mathbf{d}y)\\ &\quad+X_2(\mathbf{d}p_y-\sigma'(y)p_x\mathbf{d}z)+X_3(-\sigma(y)\mathbf{d}z-\mathbf{d}x)+X_4(-\mathbf{d}y)\\ &=(-X_3)\mathbf{d}x+(\sigma(y)\sigma'(y)p_xX_1-X_4)\mathbf{d}y\\ &\quad+(-\sigma'(y)p_xX_2-\sigma(y)X_3)\mathbf{d}z+(1+\sigma^2(y))X_1\mathbf{d}p_x+X_2\mathbf{d}p_y.\end{aligned}$$

From the equation of distributional Hamiltonian system $\mathbf{i}_{X_{\mathcal{K}}}\omega_{\mathcal{K}}=\mathbf{d}H_{\mathcal{K}}$, we have that

$$X_1=p_x,\quad X_2=p_y,\quad X_3=0,\quad X_4=0.$$

Hence, the nonholonomic vector field is $X_{\mathcal{K}}=p_x(\partial_x+\sigma(y)\partial_z)+p_y\partial_y$, and the motion equations of the distributional Hamiltonian system $(\mathcal{K},\omega_{\mathcal{K}},H)$ are expressed as

$$\dot{x}=p_x,\quad \dot{y}=p_y,\quad \dot{z}=\sigma(y)p_x,\quad \dot{p}_x=0,\quad \dot{p}_y=0.$$

In the following we shall derive the Type I and Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi equations for the distributional Hamiltonian system $(\mathcal{K}, \omega_{\mathcal{K}}, H)$. Assume that

$$\gamma : \mathbb{R}^3 \to T^*\mathbb{R}^3, \quad \gamma(x, y, z) = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_4, \gamma_5, \gamma_6),$$

and $\lambda = \gamma \cdot \pi_Q : T^*\mathbb{R}^3 \to T^*\mathbb{R}^3$ given by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lambda(x, y, z, p_x, p_y, p_z) = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4, \lambda_5, \lambda_6) \\
&= \gamma \cdot \pi_Q(x, y, z, p_x, p_y, p_z) = \gamma(x, y, z) \\
&= (\gamma_1 \cdot \pi_Q, \gamma_2 \cdot \pi_Q, \gamma_3 \cdot \pi_Q, \gamma_4 \cdot \pi_Q, \gamma_5 \cdot \pi_Q, \gamma_6 \cdot \pi_Q),
\end{aligned}$$

that is, $\lambda_i = \gamma_i \cdot \pi_Q,\ i = 1, \cdots, 6$, where $\lambda_i,\ i = 1, \cdots, 6$, are functions on $T^*\mathbb{R}^3$, and $\gamma_i,\ i = 1, \cdots, 6$, are functions on $\mathbb{R}^3$. We may choose $q = (x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3$, such that $\gamma_1(q) = x,\ \gamma_2(q) = y,\ \gamma_3(q) = z$, and $\gamma(q) = \gamma_4(q)\mathbf{d}x + \gamma_5(q)\mathbf{d}y + \gamma_6(q)\mathbf{d}z$. Note that $\mathcal{D}(q) = \mathrm{Span}\{\partial_x + \sigma(y)\partial_z,\ \partial_y\}$, take that $\alpha = \partial_x + \sigma(y)\partial_z$ and $\beta = \partial_y$, then we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{d}\gamma(\alpha, \beta) &= \alpha(\gamma(\beta)) - \beta(\gamma(\alpha)) - \gamma([\alpha, \beta]) \\
&= (\frac{\partial \gamma_5}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial \gamma_4}{\partial y}) - \sigma(y)(\frac{\partial \gamma_6}{\partial y} - \frac{\partial \gamma_5}{\partial z}) - 2\sigma'(y)\gamma_6.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, when $\mathbf{d}\gamma(\alpha, \beta) = 0$, we know that for any $v, w \in \mathcal{F}$, and $T\pi_Q(v),\ T\pi_Q(w) \in \mathcal{D}$, then $\mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(v), T\pi_Q(w)) = 0$, that is, γ is closed on $\mathcal{D}$ with respect to $T\pi_Q : TT^*\mathbb{R}^3 \to T\mathbb{R}^3$. Note that $Im(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{M}$, then $p_x = \gamma_4,\ p_y = \gamma_5\ p_z = \gamma_6$ and $\gamma_6 = \sigma(y)\gamma_4$, and hence

$$H \cdot \gamma = \frac{1}{2}((1 + \sigma^2(y))\gamma_4^2 + \gamma_5^2),$$

$$X_H \cdot \gamma = \gamma_4\partial_x + \gamma_5\partial_y + \sigma(y)\gamma_4\partial_z = X_{\mathcal{K}} \cdot \gamma,$$

$$X_H^\gamma = T\pi_Q \cdot X_H \cdot \gamma = \gamma_4\partial_x + \gamma_5\partial_y + \sigma(y)\gamma_4\partial_z.$$

Thus, $T\gamma \cdot X_H^\gamma = X_{\mathcal{K}} \cdot \gamma$, that is, the Type I of Hamilton-Jacobi equation for the distributional Hamiltonian system $(\mathcal{K}, \omega_{\mathcal{K}}, H)$ holds trivially.

Now, for any symplectic map $\varepsilon : T^*\mathbb{R}^3 \to T^*\mathbb{R}^3$, from $\omega = \varepsilon^*\omega = \omega \cdot \varepsilon = (\partial_x\varepsilon \cdot \partial_{p_x}\varepsilon)\mathbf{d}x \wedge \mathbf{d}p_x + (\partial_y\varepsilon \cdot \partial_{p_y}\varepsilon)\mathbf{d}y \wedge \mathbf{d}p_y + (\partial_z\varepsilon \cdot \partial_{p_z}\varepsilon)\mathbf{d}z \wedge \mathbf{d}p_z$, we have that

$$\partial_x\varepsilon \cdot \partial_{p_x}\varepsilon = 1, \qquad \partial_y\varepsilon \cdot \partial_{p_y}\varepsilon = 1, \qquad \partial_z\varepsilon \cdot \partial_{p_z}\varepsilon = 1.$$

Denote by $\varepsilon(x, y, z, p_x, p_y, p_z) = (\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_3, \varepsilon_4, \varepsilon_5, \varepsilon_6)$, then we have that

$$H \cdot \varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon_4^2 + \varepsilon_5^2 + \varepsilon_6^2),$$

and

$$X_H \cdot \varepsilon = \varepsilon_4\partial_x + \varepsilon_5\partial_y + \varepsilon_6\partial_z,$$

and hence

$$X_H^\varepsilon = T\pi_Q \cdot X_H \cdot \varepsilon = \varepsilon_4\partial_x + \varepsilon_5\partial_y + \varepsilon_6\partial_z.$$

Since $Im(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{M}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} T\gamma \cdot X_H^{\varepsilon} &= \varepsilon_4 \partial_x + \varepsilon_5 \partial_y + \sigma(y)\varepsilon_4 \partial_z \\ &= \varepsilon_4(\partial_x + \sigma(y)\partial_z) + \varepsilon_5 \partial_y = X_{\mathcal{K}} \cdot \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

because $\varepsilon_6 = \sigma(y)\varepsilon_4$. In the same way, note that $\lambda = \gamma \cdot \pi_Q$, and $Im(\lambda) \subset \mathcal{M}$, then

$$T\lambda \cdot X_H \cdot \varepsilon = \varepsilon_4 \partial_x + \varepsilon_5 \partial_y + \sigma(y)\varepsilon_4 \partial_z = X_{\mathcal{K}} \cdot \varepsilon.$$

On the other hand, since $\varepsilon : T^*Q \to T^*Q$ is symplectic, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{\mathcal{K}} \cdot T\varepsilon \cdot X_{H\cdot\varepsilon} &= \tau_{\mathcal{K}} \cdot X_H \cdot \varepsilon \\ &= \varepsilon_4 \partial_x + \varepsilon_5 \partial_y + \sigma(y)\varepsilon_4 \partial_z = X_{\mathcal{K}} \cdot \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $T\gamma \cdot X_H^{\varepsilon} = X_{\mathcal{K}} \cdot \varepsilon = T\lambda \cdot X_H \cdot \varepsilon = \tau_{\mathcal{K}} \cdot T\varepsilon \cdot X_{H\cdot\varepsilon}$. In this case, we must have that ε is a solution of the Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi equation $T\gamma \cdot X_H^{\varepsilon} = X_{\mathcal{K}} \cdot \varepsilon$, for the distributional Hamiltonian system $(\mathcal{K}, \omega_{\mathcal{K}}, H)$, if and only if it is a solution of the equation $T\lambda \cdot X_H \cdot \varepsilon = \tau_{\mathcal{K}} \cdot T\varepsilon \cdot X_{H\cdot\varepsilon}$.

Next, we consider the action of Lie group $G = \mathbb{R}^2$ on $\mathbb{R}^3$, and derive the motion equations and the Type I and Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi equations of the nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system. At first, the action of Lie group $G = \mathbb{R}^2$ on $\mathbb{R}^3$ is given by

$$\Phi : G \times \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}^3, \ \Phi((r,s),(x,y,z)) = (x+r, y, z+s),$$

and we have the cotangent lifted G-action on $T^*\mathbb{R}^3$, such that the Hamiltonian $H : T^*\mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}$ is G-invariant. Therefore,

$$\bar{\mathcal{M}} = \{(y, p_x, p_y, p_z) \in T^*\mathbb{R}^3/G |\ p_z = \sigma(y)p_x\},$$

and the distribution $\bar{\mathcal{K}} = \operatorname{span}\{(1+\sigma^2(y))\partial_y - \sigma(y)\sigma'(y)p_x\partial_{p_x}, \partial_{p_y}\}$, and the non-degenerate distributional two-form $\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}$ is given by

$$\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} = \mathbf{d}x \wedge \mathbf{d}p_x + \mathbf{d}y \wedge \mathbf{d}p_y + \mathbf{d}z \wedge (p_x\sigma'(y)\mathbf{d}y + \sigma(y)\mathbf{d}p_x).$$

A direct computation yields

$$\mathbf{i}_{(1+\sigma^2(y))\partial_y - \sigma(y)\sigma'(y)p_x\partial_{p_x}}\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} = \sigma(y)\sigma'(y)p_x\mathbf{d}x - \sigma'(y)p_x\mathbf{d}z + (1+\sigma^2(y))\mathbf{d}p_y, \quad \mathbf{i}_{\partial_{p_y}}\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} = -\mathbf{d}y$$

and

$$\mathbf{d}h_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} = \mathbf{d}H_{\mathcal{K}} = \sigma(y)\sigma'(y)p_x^2\mathbf{d}y + (1+\sigma^2(y))p_x\mathbf{d}p_x + p_y\mathbf{d}p_y.$$

Assume that $X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} = X_1((1+\sigma^2(y))\partial_y - \sigma(y)\sigma'(y)p_x\partial_{p_x}) + X_2\partial_{p_y}$, then we have that

$$\mathbf{i}_{X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}}\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} = X_1(\sigma(y)\sigma'(y)p_x\mathbf{d}x - \sigma'(y)p_x\mathbf{d}z + (1+\sigma^2(y))\mathbf{d}p_y) - X_2\mathbf{d}z$$

$$= (X_1\sigma(y)\sigma'(y)p_x)\mathbf{d}x + (-X_2)\mathbf{d}y + (-X_1\sigma'(y)p_x)\mathbf{d}z + (X_1(1+\sigma^2(y)))\mathbf{d}p_y.$$

From the nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian equation $\mathbf{i}_{X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}}\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} = \mathbf{d}h_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}$, we have that $X_1 = 0$, $X_2 = -\sigma(y)\sigma'(y)p_x^2$. Hence, we get that the nonholonomic reduced vector field is $X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} = -\sigma(y)\sigma'(y)p_x^2\partial_{p_y}$, and the motion equations of the nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system $(\bar{\mathcal{K}}, \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}, h)$ are expressed as

$$\dot{y} = 0, \quad \dot{p}_x = 0, \quad \dot{p}_y = -\sigma(y)\sigma'(y)p_x^2.$$

In the following we shall derive the Type I and Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi equations of the nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system $(\bar{\mathcal{K}}, \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}, h)$. Assume that $\gamma : \mathbb{R}^3 \to T^*\mathbb{R}^3$, and $\lambda = \gamma \cdot \pi_Q : T^*\mathbb{R}^3 \to T^*\mathbb{R}^3$, and $\mathrm{Im}(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{M}$, and it is G-invariant, $\mathrm{Im}(T\gamma) \subset \mathcal{K}$, then we have that $\bar{\gamma} = \pi_{/G}(\gamma) : \mathbb{R}^3 \to T^*\mathbb{R}^3/G$, $\bar{\gamma}(x,y,z) = (\bar{\gamma}_0, \bar{\gamma}_1, \bar{\gamma}_2, \bar{\gamma}_3)$, and $\bar{\lambda} = \pi_{/G}(\lambda) : T^*\mathbb{R}^3 \to T^*\mathbb{R}^3/G$, $\bar{\lambda}(x,y,z,p_x,p_y,p_z) = (\bar{\lambda}_0, \bar{\lambda}_1, \bar{\lambda}_2, \bar{\lambda}_3)$, that is, $\bar{\lambda}_i = \bar{\gamma}_i \cdot \pi_Q$, $i = 0, \cdots, 3$, where $\bar{\lambda}_i$, $i = 0, \cdots, 3$, are functions on $T^*\mathbb{R}^3$, and $\bar{\gamma}_i$, $i = 0, \cdots, 3$, are functions on $\mathbb{R}^3$. Note that $h \cdot \pi_{/G} = \tau_{\mathcal{M}} \cdot H$, since $Im(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{M}$, and it is G-invariant, we have that $Im(\bar{\gamma}) \subset \bar{\mathcal{M}}$, and $\bar{\gamma}_3 = \sigma(y)\bar{\gamma}_1$, and hence

$$h \cdot \bar{\gamma} = \frac{1}{2}((1+\sigma^2(y))\bar{\gamma}_1^2 + \bar{\gamma}_2^2),$$

and

$$X_h \cdot \bar{\gamma} = \bar{\gamma}_2 \partial_y - \sigma(y)\sigma'(y)\bar{\gamma}_1^2 \partial_{p_y}.$$

When $\mathbf{d}\gamma(\alpha, \beta) = 0$, that is, γ is closed on $\mathcal{D}$ with respect to $T\pi_Q : TT^*\mathbb{R}^3 \to T\mathbb{R}^3$, we have that

$$T\bar{\gamma} \cdot X_H^{\gamma} = \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot X_h \cdot \bar{\gamma} = -\sigma(y)\sigma'(y)\bar{\gamma}_1^2 \partial_{p_y} = X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot \bar{\gamma},$$

that is, the Type I of Hamilton-Jacobi equation for the nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system $(\bar{\mathcal{K}}, \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}, h)$ holds.

Now, for any G-invariant symplectic map $\varepsilon : T^*\mathbb{R}^3 \to T^*\mathbb{R}^3$, $\bar{\varepsilon} = \pi_{/G}(\varepsilon) : T^*\mathbb{R}^3 \to T^*\mathbb{R}^3/G$, is given by $\bar{\varepsilon}(x,y,z,p_x,p_y,p_z) = (\bar{\varepsilon}_0, \bar{\varepsilon}_1, \bar{\varepsilon}_2, \bar{\varepsilon}_3)$, then we have that

$$h \cdot \bar{\varepsilon} = \frac{1}{2}((1+\sigma^2(y))\bar{\varepsilon}_1^2 + \bar{\varepsilon}_2^2),$$

and

$$X_h \cdot \bar{\varepsilon} = \bar{\varepsilon}_2 \partial_y - \sigma(y)\sigma'(y)\bar{\varepsilon}_1^2 \partial_{p_y}.$$

Because $Im(\bar{\gamma}) \subset \bar{\mathcal{M}}$, and $Im(T\bar{\gamma}) \subset \bar{\mathcal{K}}$, and hence

$$T\bar{\gamma} \cdot X_H^{\varepsilon} = \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot X_h \cdot \bar{\varepsilon} = -\sigma(y)\sigma'(y)\bar{\varepsilon}_1^2 \partial_{p_y} = X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot \bar{\varepsilon}.$$

Note that $\bar{\lambda} = \bar{\gamma} \cdot \pi_Q$, and $Im(\bar{\lambda}) \subset \bar{\mathcal{M}}$, and $Im(T\bar{\lambda}) \subset \bar{\mathcal{K}}$, then we have that

$$T\bar{\lambda} \cdot X_H \cdot \varepsilon = \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot X_h \cdot \bar{\varepsilon} = X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot \bar{\varepsilon}.$$

On the other hand, since $\varepsilon : T^*\mathbb{R}^3 \to T^*\mathbb{R}^3$ is symplectic, and $\bar{\varepsilon}^* = \varepsilon^* \cdot \pi_{/G}^* : T^*(T^*\mathbb{R}^3)/G \to T^*T^*\mathbb{R}^3$ is also symplectic along $\bar{\varepsilon}$, then we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot T\bar{\varepsilon} \cdot X_{h \cdot \bar{\varepsilon}} &= \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot X_h \cdot \bar{\varepsilon} \\ &= -\sigma(y)\sigma'(y)\bar{\varepsilon}_1^2 \partial_{p_y} = X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot \bar{\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $T\bar{\gamma} \cdot X_H^{\varepsilon} = X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot \bar{\varepsilon} = T\bar{\lambda} \cdot X_H \cdot \varepsilon = \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot T\bar{\varepsilon} \cdot X_{h \cdot \bar{\varepsilon}}$. In this case, we must have that ε and $\bar{\varepsilon}$ are the solution of the Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi equation $T\bar{\gamma} \cdot X_H^{\varepsilon} = X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot \bar{\varepsilon}$, for the nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system $(\bar{\mathcal{K}}, \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}, h)$, if and only if they satisfy the equation $T\bar{\lambda} \cdot X_H \cdot \varepsilon = \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot T\bar{\varepsilon} \cdot X_{h \cdot \bar{\varepsilon}}$.

6.2 The vertical rolling disk

In this subsection, we consider the motion of a vertical rolling disk, and derive explicitly the motion equations and the Type I and Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi equations of this problem. Assume that a vertical disk of zero width rolls without slipping on a horizontal plane and it rotates freely about its vertical axis. Let x and y denote the position of contact point of the disk in the plane, and the variables θ and φ denote the orientations of a chosen material point with respect to the vertical plane and the "heading angle" of the disk, see [5]. Thus, the configuration space of motion for the vertical rolling disk is $Q = \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1 \times \mathbb{S}^1$ whose coordinates are denoted by $q = (x, y, \theta, \varphi)$, and its velocity space is TQ, and the phase space is T^*Q with canonical symplectic form ω. The rolling constraints on the velocities are given by

$$\mathcal{D} = \{(x, y, \theta, \varphi, \dot{x}, \dot{y}, \dot{\theta}, \dot{\varphi}) \in TQ |\ \dot{x} = R\dot{\theta}\cos\varphi,\ \dot{y} = R\dot{\theta}\sin\varphi\},$$

where R denotes the radius of the disk. For any $q \in Q$, we have that

$$\mathcal{D}(q) = \mathrm{Span}\{R\cos\varphi\partial_x + R\sin\varphi\partial_y + \partial_\theta,\ \partial_\varphi\}.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}[R\cos\varphi\partial_x + R\sin\varphi\partial_y + \partial_\theta,\ \partial_\varphi] &= [R\cos\varphi\partial_x,\ \partial_\varphi] + [R\sin\varphi\partial_y,\ \partial_\varphi] + [\partial_\theta,\ \partial_\varphi] \\ &= -R\sin\varphi\partial_x + R\cos\varphi\partial_y,\end{aligned}$$

which is nonzero everywhere and it is not in $\mathcal{D}$, then $\mathcal{D}$ is nonholonomic and it is **completely nonholonomic**, that is, $\mathcal{D}$ along with all of its iterated Lie brackets $[\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}], [\mathcal{D}, [\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}]], \cdots$ spans the tangent bundle TQ. The Lagrangian $L : TQ \to \mathbb{R}$ is the kinetic energy, that is,

$$L = \frac{1}{2}m(\dot{x}^2 + \dot{y}^2) + \frac{1}{2}I\dot{\theta}^2 + \frac{1}{2}J\dot{\varphi}^2,$$

where m is the mass of the disk, and I and J are its moments of inertia. Note that L is simple and it is hyperregular, and hence the system is **$\mathcal{D}$-regular** automatically. The momenta are $p_x = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{x}} = m\dot{x},\ p_y = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{y}} = m\dot{y},\ p_\theta = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{\theta}} = I\dot{\theta},\ p_\varphi = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{\varphi}} = J\dot{\varphi}$, and the Hamiltonian $H : T^*Q \to \mathbb{R}$ is given by

$$H = \frac{1}{2m}(p_x^2 + p_y^2) + \frac{1}{2I}p_\theta^2 + \frac{1}{2J}p_\varphi^2.$$

The unconstrained Hamiltonian vector field is

$$X_H = \frac{1}{m}p_x\partial_x + \frac{1}{m}p_y\partial_y + \frac{1}{I}p_\theta\partial_\theta + \frac{1}{J}p_\varphi\partial_\varphi.$$

By using the Legendre transformation

$$\mathcal{F}L : TQ \to T^*Q,\ \mathcal{F}L(x, y, \theta, \varphi, \dot{x}, \dot{y}, \dot{\theta}, \dot{\varphi}) = (x, y, \theta, \varphi, p_x, p_y, p_\theta, p_\varphi),$$

we obtain the constraint submanifold $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{F}L(\mathcal{D})$ given by

$$\mathcal{M} = \{(x, y, \theta, \varphi, p_x, p_y, p_\theta, p_\varphi) \in T^*Q |\ p_x = \frac{mR}{I}p_\theta\cos\varphi,\ p_y = \frac{mR}{I}p_\theta\sin\varphi\}.$$

Moreover, if we define $\mathcal{F} = (T\pi_Q)^{-1}(\mathcal{D})$, then the compatibility condition $T\mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{F}^\perp = \{0\}$ holds, where $\mathcal{F}^\perp$ denotes the symplectic orthogonal of $\mathcal{F}$ with respect to the canonical symplectic form ω. Thus,

$$\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{F} \cap T\mathcal{M} = \mathrm{span}\{\partial_\theta + R\cos\varphi\partial_x + R\sin\varphi\partial_y, \partial_\varphi, \partial_{p_\theta}, \partial_{p_\varphi}\}.$$

The induced two-form $\omega_{\mathcal{M}} = i^*_{\mathcal{M}} \cdot \omega$ is given by

$$\omega_{\mathcal{M}} = \mathbf{d}x \wedge (\frac{mR\cos\varphi}{I}\mathbf{d}p_\theta - \frac{mR\sin\varphi}{I}p_\theta\mathbf{d}\varphi) + \mathbf{d}y \wedge (\frac{mR\sin\varphi}{I}\mathbf{d}p_\theta + \frac{mR\cos\varphi}{I}p_\theta\mathbf{d}\varphi) + \mathbf{d}\theta \wedge \mathbf{d}p_\theta + \mathbf{d}\varphi \wedge \mathbf{d}p_\varphi,$$

and hence we have the non-degenerate distributional two-form $\omega_{\mathcal{K}} = \tau_{\mathcal{K}} \cdot \omega_{\mathcal{M}}$. A direct computation yields

$$\mathbf{i}_{\partial_\theta + R\cos\varphi\partial_x + R\sin\varphi\partial_y}\omega_{\mathcal{K}} = (1 + \frac{mR^2}{I})\mathbf{d}p_\theta, \qquad \mathbf{i}_{\partial_\varphi}\omega_{\mathcal{K}} = \mathbf{d}p_\varphi + \frac{mR\sin\varphi}{I}p_\theta\mathbf{d}x - \frac{mR\cos\varphi}{I}p_\theta\mathbf{d}y,$$
$$\mathbf{i}_{\partial_{p_\theta}}\omega_{\mathcal{K}} = -\frac{mR\cos\varphi}{I}\mathbf{d}x - \frac{mR\sin\varphi}{I}\mathbf{d}y - \mathbf{d}\theta, \qquad \mathbf{i}_{\partial_{p_\varphi}}\omega_{\mathcal{K}} = -\mathbf{d}\varphi,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{d}H_{\mathcal{K}} &= \frac{1}{m}\frac{mR}{I}p_\theta\cos\varphi(\frac{mR\cos\varphi}{I}\mathbf{d}p_\theta - \frac{mR\sin\varphi}{I}p_\theta\mathbf{d}\varphi)\\ &\quad + \frac{1}{m}\frac{mR}{I}p_\theta\sin\varphi(\frac{mR\sin\varphi}{I}\mathbf{d}p_\theta + \frac{mR\cos\varphi}{I}p_\theta\mathbf{d}\varphi) + \frac{1}{I}p_\theta\mathbf{d}p_\theta + \frac{1}{J}p_\varphi\mathbf{d}p_\varphi\\ &= \frac{1}{I}(1 + \frac{mR^2}{I})p_\theta\mathbf{d}p_\theta + \frac{1}{J}p_\varphi\mathbf{d}p_\varphi.\end{aligned}$$

Assume that $X_{\mathcal{K}} = X_1(\partial_\theta + R\cos\varphi\partial_x + R\sin\varphi\partial_y) + X_2\partial_\varphi + X_3\partial_{p_\theta} + X_4\partial_{p_\varphi}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{i}_{X_{\mathcal{K}}}\omega_{\mathcal{K}} &= X_1((1 + \frac{mR^2}{I})\mathbf{d}p_\theta) + X_2(\mathbf{d}p_\varphi + \frac{mR\sin\varphi}{I}p_\theta\mathbf{d}x - \frac{mR\cos\varphi}{I}p_\theta\mathbf{d}y)\\ &\quad + X_3(-\frac{mR\cos\varphi}{I}\mathbf{d}x - \frac{mR\sin\varphi}{I}\mathbf{d}y - \mathbf{d}\theta) + X_4(-\mathbf{d}\varphi)\\ &= (X_2\frac{mR\sin\varphi}{I}p_\theta - X_3\frac{mR\cos\varphi}{I})\mathbf{d}x + (-X_2\frac{mR\cos\varphi}{I}p_\theta - X_3\frac{mR\sin\varphi}{I})\mathbf{d}y\\ &\quad + (-X_3)\mathbf{d}\theta + (-X_4)\mathbf{d}\varphi + (X_1(1 + \frac{mR^2}{I}))\mathbf{d}p_\theta + (X_2)\mathbf{d}p_\varphi.\end{aligned}$$

From the distributional Hamiltonian equation $\mathbf{i}_{X_{\mathcal{K}}}\omega_{\mathcal{K}} = \mathbf{d}H_{\mathcal{K}}$, we have that

$$X_1 = \frac{1}{I}p_\theta, \quad X_2 = \frac{1}{J}p_\varphi, \quad X_3 = 0, \quad X_4 = 0.$$

Hence, we get that the nonholonomic vector field

$$X_{\mathcal{K}} = \frac{1}{I}p_\theta(\partial_\theta + R\cos\varphi\partial_x + R\sin\varphi\partial_y) + \frac{1}{J}p_\varphi\partial_\varphi,$$

and the motion equations of the distributional Hamiltonian system $(\mathcal{K}, \omega_{\mathcal{K}}, H)$ are given by

$$\dot{x} = \frac{R\cos\varphi}{I}p_\theta, \quad \dot{y} = \frac{R\sin\varphi}{I}p_\theta, \quad \dot{\theta} = \frac{1}{I}p_\theta, \quad \dot{\varphi} = \frac{1}{J}p_\varphi, \quad \dot{p}_\theta = 0, \quad \dot{p}_\varphi = 0.$$

In the following we shall derive the Type I and Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi equations for the distributional Hamiltonian system $(\mathcal{K}, \omega_{\mathcal{K}}, H)$. Assume that

$$\gamma : Q \to T^*Q, \quad \gamma(x, y, \theta, \varphi) = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_4, \gamma_5, \gamma_6, \gamma_7, \gamma_8),$$

then $\lambda=\gamma\cdot\pi_Q: T^*Q\rightarrow T^*Q$ given by

$$\begin{aligned}&\lambda(x,y,\theta,\varphi,p_x,p_y,p_\theta,p_\varphi)=(\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\lambda_3,\lambda_4,\lambda_5,\lambda_6,\lambda_7,\lambda_8)\\&=\gamma\cdot\pi_Q(x,y,\theta,\varphi,p_x,p_y,p_\theta,p_\varphi)=\gamma(x,y,\theta,\varphi)\\&=(\gamma_1\cdot\pi_Q,\gamma_2\cdot\pi_Q,\gamma_3\cdot\pi_Q,\gamma_4\cdot\pi_Q,\gamma_5\cdot\pi_Q,\gamma_6\cdot\pi_Q,\gamma_7\cdot\pi_Q,\gamma_8\cdot\pi_Q),\end{aligned}$$

that is, $\lambda_i=\gamma_i\cdot\pi_Q,\ i=1,\cdots,8$, where $\lambda_i,\ i=1,\cdots,8$, are functions on T^*Q, and $\gamma_i,\ i=1,\cdots,8$, are functions on Q. We may choose $q=(x,y,\theta,\varphi)\in Q$, such that $\gamma_1(q)=x,\ \gamma_2(q)=y,\ \gamma_3(q)=\theta,\ \gamma_4(q)=\varphi$, and $\gamma(q)=\gamma_5(q)\mathbf{d}x+\gamma_6(q)\mathbf{d}y+\gamma_7(q)\mathbf{d}\theta+\gamma_8(q)\mathbf{d}\varphi$. Note that $\mathcal{D}(q)=\operatorname{Span}\{R\cos\varphi\partial_x+R\sin\varphi\partial_y+\partial_\theta,\ \partial_\varphi\}$, take that $\alpha=R\cos\varphi\partial_x+R\sin\varphi\partial_y+\partial_\theta$ and $\beta=\partial_\varphi$, then we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{d}\gamma(\alpha,\beta)&=\alpha(\gamma(\beta))-\beta(\gamma(\alpha))-\gamma([\alpha,\beta])\\&=R\cos\varphi(\frac{\partial\gamma_8}{\partial x}-\frac{\partial\gamma_5}{\partial\varphi})+R\sin\varphi(\frac{\partial\gamma_8}{\partial y}-\frac{\partial\gamma_6}{\partial\varphi})\\&\quad+(\frac{\partial\gamma_8}{\partial\theta}-\frac{\partial\gamma_7}{\partial\varphi})+2(R\sin\varphi\gamma_5-R\cos\varphi\gamma_6).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, when $\mathbf{d}\gamma(\alpha,\beta)=0$, we know that for any $v,w\in\mathcal{F}$, and $T\pi_Q(v),\ T\pi_Q(w)\in\mathcal{D}$, then $\mathbf{d}\gamma(T\pi_Q(v),T\pi_Q(w))=0$, that is, γ is closed on $\mathcal{D}$ with respect to $T\pi_Q: TT^*Q\rightarrow TQ$. Note that $Im(\gamma)\subset\mathcal{M}$, then we have that $p_x=\gamma_5,\ p_y=\gamma_6,\ p_\theta=\gamma_7.\ p_\varphi=\gamma_8$, and $\gamma_5=\frac{mR}{I}\gamma_7\cos\varphi,\ \ \gamma_6=\frac{mR}{I}\gamma_7\sin\varphi$. Hence,

$$H\cdot\gamma=\frac{1}{2m}(\frac{m^2R^2}{I^2}\gamma_7^2)+\frac{1}{2I}\gamma_7^2+\frac{1}{2J}\gamma_8^2=\frac{1}{2I}(1+\frac{mR^2}{I})\gamma_7^2+\frac{1}{2J}\gamma_8^2,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}X_H\cdot\gamma&=\frac{R}{I}\gamma_7\cos\varphi\partial_x+\frac{R}{I}\gamma_7\sin\varphi\partial_y+\frac{1}{I}\gamma_7\partial_\theta+\frac{1}{J}\gamma_8\partial_\varphi\\&=\frac{\gamma_7}{I}(R\cos\varphi\partial_x+R\sin\varphi\partial_y+\partial_\theta)+\frac{\gamma_8}{J}\partial_\varphi=X_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot\gamma,\end{aligned}$$

$$X_H^\gamma=T\pi_Q\cdot X_H\cdot\gamma=\frac{\gamma_7}{I}(R\cos\varphi\partial_x+R\sin\varphi\partial_y+\partial_\theta)+\frac{\gamma_8}{J}\partial_\varphi.$$

Thus, $T\gamma\cdot X_H^\gamma=X_{\mathcal{K}}\cdot\gamma$, that is, the Type I of Hamilton-Jacobi equation for the distributional Hamiltonian system $(\mathcal{K},\omega_{\mathcal{K}},H)$ holds trivially.

Now, for any symplectic map $\varepsilon: T^*Q\rightarrow T^*Q$, from $\omega=\varepsilon^*\omega=\omega\cdot\varepsilon=(\partial_x\varepsilon\cdot\partial_{p_x}\varepsilon)\mathbf{d}x\wedge\mathbf{d}p_x+(\partial_y\varepsilon\cdot\partial_{p_y}\varepsilon)\mathbf{d}y\wedge\mathbf{d}p_y+(\partial_\theta\varepsilon\cdot\partial_{p_\theta}\varepsilon)\mathbf{d}\theta\wedge\mathbf{d}p_\theta+(\partial_\varphi\varepsilon\cdot\partial_{p_\varphi}\varepsilon)\mathbf{d}\varphi\wedge\mathbf{d}p_\varphi$, we have that

$$\partial_x\varepsilon\cdot\partial_{p_x}\varepsilon=1,\qquad\partial_y\varepsilon\cdot\partial_{p_y}\varepsilon=1,\qquad\partial_\theta\varepsilon\cdot\partial_{p_\theta}\varepsilon=1,\qquad\partial_\varphi\varepsilon\cdot\partial_{p_\varphi}\varepsilon=1.$$

Denote by $\varepsilon(x,y,\theta,\varphi,p_x,p_y,p_\theta,p_\varphi)=(\varepsilon_1,\varepsilon_2,\varepsilon_3,\varepsilon_4,\varepsilon_5,\varepsilon_6,\varepsilon_7,\varepsilon_8)$, then we have that

$$H\cdot\varepsilon=\frac{1}{2m}(\varepsilon_5^2+\varepsilon_6^2)+\frac{1}{2I}\varepsilon_7^2+\frac{1}{2J}\varepsilon_8^2,$$

and

$$X_H\cdot\varepsilon=\frac{1}{m}\varepsilon_5\partial_x+\frac{1}{m}\varepsilon_6\partial_y+\frac{1}{I}\varepsilon_7\partial_\theta+\frac{1}{J}\varepsilon_8\partial_\varphi,$$

and hence

$$X_H^\varepsilon=T\pi_Q\cdot X_H\cdot\varepsilon=\frac{1}{m}\varepsilon_5\partial_x+\frac{1}{m}\varepsilon_6\partial_y+\frac{1}{I}\varepsilon_7\partial_\theta+\frac{1}{J}\varepsilon_8\partial_\varphi.$$

Since $Im(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{M}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} T\gamma \cdot X_H^\varepsilon &= T\gamma \cdot (\frac{1}{m}\varepsilon_5 \partial_x + \frac{1}{m}\varepsilon_6 \partial_y + \frac{1}{I}\varepsilon_7 \partial_\theta + \frac{1}{J}\varepsilon_8 \partial_\varphi) \\ &= \frac{R}{I}\varepsilon_7 \cos\varphi \partial_x + \frac{R}{I}\varepsilon_7 \sin\varphi \partial_y + \frac{1}{I}\varepsilon_7 \partial_\theta + \frac{1}{J}\varepsilon_8 \partial_\varphi \\ &= \frac{\varepsilon_7}{I}(R\cos\varphi \partial_x + R\sin\varphi \partial_y + \partial_\theta) + \frac{\varepsilon_8}{J}\partial_\varphi \\ &= X_\mathcal{K} \cdot \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

because $\varepsilon_5 = \frac{mR}{I}\varepsilon_7 \cos\varphi,\ \varepsilon_6 = \frac{mR}{I}\varepsilon_7 \sin\varphi$. In the same way, note that $\lambda = \gamma \cdot \pi_Q$, and $Im(\lambda) \subset \mathcal{M}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} T\lambda \cdot X_H \cdot \varepsilon &= \frac{R}{I}\varepsilon_7 \cos\varphi \partial_x + \frac{R}{I}\varepsilon_7 \sin\varphi \partial_y + \frac{1}{I}\varepsilon_7 \partial_\theta + \frac{1}{J}\varepsilon_8 \partial_\varphi \\ &= \frac{\varepsilon_7}{I}(R\cos\varphi \partial_x + R\sin\varphi \partial_y + \partial_\theta) + \frac{\varepsilon_8}{J}\partial_\varphi = X_\mathcal{K} \cdot \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since $\varepsilon : T^*Q \to T^*Q$ is symplectic, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_\mathcal{K} \cdot T\varepsilon \cdot X_{H\cdot\varepsilon} &= \tau_\mathcal{K} \cdot X_H \cdot \varepsilon \\ &= \frac{R}{I}\varepsilon_7 \cos\varphi \partial_x + \frac{R}{I}\varepsilon_7 \sin\varphi \partial_y + \frac{1}{I}\varepsilon_7 \partial_\theta + \frac{1}{J}\varepsilon_8 \partial_\varphi \\ &= \frac{\varepsilon_7}{I}(R\cos\varphi \partial_x + R\sin\varphi \partial_y + \partial_\theta) + \frac{\varepsilon_8}{J}\partial_\varphi = X_\mathcal{K} \cdot \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $T\gamma \cdot X_H^\varepsilon = X_\mathcal{K} \cdot \varepsilon = T\lambda \cdot X_H \cdot \varepsilon = \tau_\mathcal{K} \cdot T\varepsilon \cdot X_{H\cdot\varepsilon}$. In this case, we must have that ε is a solution of the Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi equation $T\gamma \cdot X_H^\varepsilon = X_\mathcal{K} \cdot \varepsilon$, for the distributional Hamiltonian system $(\mathcal{K}, \omega_\mathcal{K}, H)$, if and only if it is a solution of the equation $T\lambda \cdot X_H \cdot \varepsilon = \tau_\mathcal{K} \cdot T\varepsilon \cdot X_{H\cdot\varepsilon}$.

In the following we consider respectively the actions of two Lie groups $G = \mathbb{R}^2$ and $G = SE(2)$ on Q, and give the motion equations and the Type I and Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi equations of the nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian systems. Firstly, we consider the action of Lie group $G = \mathbb{R}^2$ on Q, which is given by

$$\Phi : G \times Q \to Q,\ \Phi((r,s),(x,y,\theta,\varphi)) = (x+r, y+s, \theta, \varphi),$$

and we have the cotangent lifted G-action on T^*Q, and the Hamiltonian $H : T^*Q \to \mathbb{R}$ is G-invariant. In this case we have that

$$\bar{\mathcal{M}} = \{(\theta, \varphi, p_x, p_y, p_\theta, p_\varphi) \in T^*Q/G |\ p_x = \frac{mR}{I}p_\theta \cos\varphi,\ p_y = \frac{mR}{I}p_\theta \sin\varphi\},$$

and the distribution

$$\bar{\mathcal{K}} = \operatorname{span}\{\partial_\theta, \partial_\varphi, \partial_{p_\theta}, \partial_{p_\varphi}\},$$

and the non-degenerate two-form $\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}$ is given by

$$\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} = (1 + \frac{mR^2}{I})\mathbf{d}\theta \wedge \mathbf{d}p_\theta + \mathbf{d}\varphi \wedge \mathbf{d}p_\varphi.$$

A direct computation yields

$$\mathbf{i}_{\partial_\theta}\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} = (1 + \frac{mR^2}{I})\mathbf{d}p_\theta, \qquad \mathbf{i}_{\partial_\varphi}\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} = \mathbf{d}p_\varphi, \qquad \mathbf{i}_{\partial_{p_\theta}}\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} = -(1 + \frac{mR^2}{I})\mathbf{d}\theta, \qquad \mathbf{i}_{\partial_{p_\varphi}}\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} = -\mathbf{d}\varphi,$$

and

$$\mathbf{d}h_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}=\mathbf{d}H_{\mathcal{K}}=\frac{1}{I}(1+\frac{mR^2}{I})p_\theta\mathbf{d}p_\theta+\frac{1}{J}p_\varphi\mathbf{d}p_\varphi.$$

Assume that $X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}=X_1\partial_\theta+X_2\partial_\varphi+X_3\partial_{p_\theta}+X_4\partial_{p_\varphi}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{i}_{X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}}\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}&=X_1((1+\frac{mR^2}{I})\mathbf{d}p_\theta)+X_2\mathbf{d}p_\varphi-X_3(1+\frac{mR^2}{I})\mathbf{d}\theta-X_4\mathbf{d}\varphi\\&=-X_3(1+\frac{mR^2}{I})\mathbf{d}\theta-X_4\mathbf{d}\varphi+X_1(1+\frac{mR^2}{I})\mathbf{d}p_\theta+X_2\mathbf{d}p_\varphi.\end{aligned}$$

From the nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian equation $\mathbf{i}_{X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}}\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}=\mathbf{d}h_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}$, we have that

$$X_1=\frac{1}{I}p_\theta,\quad X_2=\frac{1}{J}p_\varphi,\quad X_3=0,\quad X_4=0.$$

Hence, the nonholonomic reduced vector field is $X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}=\frac{1}{I}p_\theta\partial_\theta+\frac{1}{J}p_\varphi\partial_\varphi$, and the motion equations of the nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system $(\bar{\mathcal{K}},\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}},h)$ are expressed as

$$\dot{\theta}=\frac{1}{I}p_\theta,\quad \dot{\varphi}=\frac{1}{J}p_\varphi,\quad \dot{p}_\theta=0,\quad \dot{p}_\varphi=0.$$

In the following we shall derive the Type I and Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi equations for the nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system $(\bar{\mathcal{K}},\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}},h)$. As above $\gamma: Q\rightarrow T^*Q$, and $\lambda=\gamma\cdot\pi_Q: T^*Q\rightarrow T^*Q$, and assume that $\mathrm{Im}(\gamma)\subset\mathcal{M}$, and it is G-invariant, $\mathrm{Im}(T\gamma)\subset\mathcal{K}$, then we have that $\bar{\gamma}=\pi_{/G}(\gamma): Q\rightarrow T^*Q/G,\ \bar{\gamma}(x,y,\theta,\varphi)=(\bar{\gamma}_1,\bar{\gamma}_2,\bar{\gamma}_3,\bar{\gamma}_4,\bar{\gamma}_5,\bar{\gamma}_6)$, and $\bar{\lambda}=\pi_{/G}(\lambda): T^*Q\rightarrow T^*Q/G,\ \bar{\lambda}(x,y,\theta,\varphi,p_x,p_y,p_\theta,p_\varphi)=(\bar{\lambda}_1,\bar{\lambda}_2,\bar{\lambda}_3,\bar{\lambda}_4,\bar{\lambda}_5,\bar{\lambda}_6)$, that is, $\bar{\lambda}_i=\bar{\gamma}_i\cdot\pi_Q,\ i=1,\cdots,6$, where $\bar{\lambda}_i,\ i=1,\cdots,6$, are functions on T^*Q, and $\bar{\gamma}_j,\ i=1,\cdots,6$, are functions on Q. Note that $h\cdot\pi_{/G}=\tau_{\mathcal{M}}\cdot H$, and the distribution $\bar{\mathcal{K}}=\mathrm{span}\{\partial_\theta,\partial_\varphi,\partial_{p_\theta},\partial_{p_\varphi}\}$, then we have that

$$h\cdot\bar{\gamma}=\frac{1}{2I}\bar{\gamma}_5^2+\frac{1}{2J}\bar{\gamma}_6^2,\qquad X_h\cdot\bar{\gamma}=\frac{1}{I}\bar{\gamma}_5\partial_\theta+\frac{1}{J}\bar{\gamma}_6\partial_\varphi.$$

When $\mathbf{d}\gamma(\alpha,\beta)=0$, that is, γ is closed on $\mathcal{D}$ with respect to $T\pi_Q: TT^*Q\rightarrow TQ$, we have that

$$T\bar{\gamma}\cdot X_H^\gamma=\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot X_h\cdot\bar{\gamma}=X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\bar{\gamma},$$

that is, the Type I of Hamilton-Jacobi equation for the nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system $(\bar{\mathcal{K}},\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}},h)$ holds.

Now, for any G-invariant symplectic map $\varepsilon: T^*Q\rightarrow T^*Q$, $\bar{\varepsilon}=\pi_{/G}(\varepsilon): T^*Q\rightarrow T^*Q/G$, is given by $\bar{\varepsilon}(x,y,\theta,\varphi,p_x,p_y,p_\theta,p_\varphi)=(\bar{\varepsilon}_1,\bar{\varepsilon}_2,\bar{\varepsilon}_3,\bar{\varepsilon}_4,\bar{\varepsilon}_5,\bar{\varepsilon}_6)$, then we have that

$$h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}=\frac{1}{2I}\bar{\varepsilon}_5^2+\frac{1}{2J}\bar{\varepsilon}_6^2,\qquad X_h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}=\frac{1}{I}\bar{\varepsilon}_5\partial_\theta+\frac{1}{J}\bar{\varepsilon}_6\partial_\varphi.$$

Since $\mathrm{Im}(\gamma)\subset\mathcal{M}$, and $\mathrm{Im}(T\gamma)\subset\mathcal{K}$, and hence $Im(\bar{\gamma})\subset\bar{\mathcal{M}}$, $Im(T\bar{\gamma})\subset\bar{\mathcal{K}}$. Thus,

$$T\bar{\gamma}\cdot X_H^\varepsilon=\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot X_h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}=\frac{1}{I}\bar{\varepsilon}_5\partial_\theta+\frac{1}{J}\bar{\varepsilon}_6\partial_\varphi=X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}.$$

Note that $\bar{\lambda}=\bar{\gamma}\cdot\pi_Q$, and $Im(\bar{\lambda})\subset\bar{\mathcal{M}}$, and $Im(T\bar{\lambda})\subset\bar{\mathcal{K}}$, then we have that

$$T\bar{\lambda}\cdot X_H\cdot\varepsilon=\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot X_h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}=X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}.$$

On the other hand, since $\varepsilon: T^*Q \to T^*Q$ is symplectic, and $\bar{\varepsilon}^* = \varepsilon^* \cdot \pi^*_{/G} : T^*(T^*Q)/G \to T^*T^*Q$ is also symplectic along $\bar{\varepsilon}$, then we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot T\bar{\varepsilon} \cdot X_{h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}} &= \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot X_h \cdot \bar{\varepsilon} \\ &= \frac{1}{I}\bar{\varepsilon}_5 \partial_\theta + \frac{1}{J}\bar{\varepsilon}_6 \partial_\varphi = X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot \bar{\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $T\bar{\gamma} \cdot X^\varepsilon_H = X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot \bar{\varepsilon} = T\bar{\lambda} \cdot X_H \cdot \varepsilon = \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot T\bar{\varepsilon} \cdot X_{h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}}$. In this case, we must have that ε and $\bar{\varepsilon}$ are the solution of the Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi equation $T\bar{\gamma} \cdot X^\varepsilon_H = X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot \bar{\varepsilon}$, for the nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system $(\bar{\mathcal{K}}, \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}, h)$, if and only if they satisfy the equation $T\bar{\lambda} \cdot X_H \cdot \varepsilon = \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} \cdot T\bar{\varepsilon} \cdot X_{h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}}$.

Next, we consider the action of the Lie group $G = SE(2) \cong SO(2)\circledS\mathbb{R}^2$ on Q, which is given by

$$\Phi : G \times Q \to Q,\ \Phi((\alpha, r, s), (x, y, \theta, \varphi)) = (x\cos\alpha - y\sin\alpha + r, x\sin\alpha + y\cos\alpha + s, \theta, \varphi + \alpha),$$

and we have the cotangent lifted G-action on T^*Q; then the Hamiltonian $H : T^*Q \to \mathbb{R}$ is G-invariant. In this case we have that

$$\bar{\mathcal{M}} = \{(\theta, p_x, p_y, p_\theta) \in T^*Q/G |\ p_x = \frac{mR}{I} p_\theta \cos\varphi,\ p_y = \frac{mR}{I} p_\theta \sin\varphi\},$$

and the distribution $\bar{\mathcal{K}} = \mathrm{span}\{\partial_\theta, \partial_{p_\theta}\}$, and the non-degenerate two-form $\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}$ is given by

$$\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} = (1 + \frac{mR^2}{I})\mathbf{d}\theta \wedge \mathbf{d}p_\theta.$$

A direct computation yields

$$\mathbf{i}_{\partial_\theta}\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} = (1 + \frac{mR^2}{I})\mathbf{d}p_\theta, \qquad \mathbf{i}_{\partial_{p_\theta}}\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} = -(1 + \frac{mR^2}{I})\mathbf{d}\theta,$$

and

$$\mathbf{d}h_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} = \mathbf{d}H_{\mathcal{K}} = \frac{1}{I}(1 + \frac{mR^2}{I})p_\theta \mathbf{d}p_\theta + \frac{1}{J}p_\varphi \mathbf{d}p_\varphi.$$

Assume that $X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} = X_1\partial_\theta + X_2\partial_{p_\theta}$, then we have that

$$\mathbf{i}_{X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}}\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} = X_1((1 + \frac{mR^2}{I})\mathbf{d}p_\theta) + X_2(-(1 + \frac{mR^2}{I})\mathbf{d}\theta).$$

From the nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian equation $\mathbf{i}_{X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}}\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} = \mathbf{d}h_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}$, we have that $X_1 = \frac{1}{I}p_\theta,\ \ X_2 = 0$. Hence, the nonholonomic reduced vector field is $X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}} = \frac{1}{I}p_\theta\partial_\theta$, and the motion equations of the nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system $(\bar{\mathcal{K}}, \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}, h)$ are the following

$$\dot{\theta} = \frac{1}{I}p_\theta, \quad \dot{p}_\theta = 0.$$

In the following we shall derive the Type I and Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi equations for the nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system $(\bar{\mathcal{K}}, \omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}, h)$. As above $\gamma : Q \to T^*Q$, and $\lambda = \gamma \cdot \pi_Q : T^*Q \to T^*Q$, and assume that $\mathrm{Im}(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{M}$, and it is G-invariant, $\mathrm{Im}(T\gamma) \subset \mathcal{K}$, then we have that $\bar{\gamma} = \pi_{/G}(\gamma) : Q \to T^*Q/G,\ \bar{\gamma}(x, y, \theta, \varphi) = (\bar{\gamma}_1, \bar{\gamma}_2, \bar{\gamma}_3, \bar{\gamma}_4)$, and $\bar{\lambda} = \pi_{/G}(\lambda) : T^*Q \to T^*Q/G,\ \bar{\lambda}(x, y, \theta, \varphi, p_x, p_y, p_\theta, p_\varphi) = (\bar{\lambda}_1, \bar{\lambda}_2, \bar{\lambda}_3, \bar{\lambda}_4)$, that is, $\bar{\lambda}_i = \bar{\gamma}_i \cdot \pi_Q,\ i = 1, \cdots, 4$, where $\bar{\lambda}_i,\ i=1,\cdots,4$, are functions on T^*Q, and $\bar{\gamma}_i,\ i=1,\cdots,4$, are functions on Q. Note that $h\cdot\pi_{/G}=\tau_{\mathcal{M}}\cdot H$, and the distribution $\bar{\mathcal{K}}=\operatorname{span}\{\partial_\theta,\partial_{p_\theta}\}$, then we have that

$$h\cdot\bar{\gamma}=\frac{1}{2I}\bar{\gamma}_3^2, \qquad\qquad X_h\cdot\bar{\gamma}=\frac{1}{I}\bar{\gamma}_3\partial_\theta.$$

When $\mathbf{d}\gamma(\alpha,\beta)=0$, that is, γ is closed on $\mathcal{D}$ with respect to $T\pi_Q:TT^*Q\to TQ$, we have that

$$T\bar{\gamma}\cdot X_H^\gamma=\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot X_h\cdot\bar{\gamma}=X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\bar{\gamma},$$

that is, the Type I of Hamilton-Jacobi equation for the nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system $(\bar{\mathcal{K}},\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}},h)$ holds.

Now, for any G-invariant symplectic map $\varepsilon:T^*Q\to T^*Q$, $\bar{\varepsilon}=\pi_{/G}(\varepsilon):T^*Q\to T^*Q/G$, is given by $\bar{\varepsilon}(x,y,\theta,\varphi,p_x,p_y,p_\theta,p_\varphi)=(\bar{\varepsilon}_1,\bar{\varepsilon}_2,\bar{\varepsilon}_3,\bar{\varepsilon}_4)$, then we have that

$$h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}=\frac{1}{2I}\bar{\varepsilon}_3^2, \qquad\qquad X_h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}=\frac{1}{I}\bar{\varepsilon}_3\partial_\theta.$$

Since $\mathrm{Im}(\gamma)\subset\mathcal{M}$, and $\mathrm{Im}(T\gamma)\subset\mathcal{K}$, and hence $Im(\bar{\gamma})\subset\bar{\mathcal{M}}$, $Im(T\bar{\gamma})\subset\bar{\mathcal{K}}$. Thus,

$$T\bar{\gamma}\cdot X_H^\varepsilon=\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot X_h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}=\frac{1}{I}\bar{\varepsilon}_3\partial_\theta=X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}.$$

Note that $\bar{\lambda}=\bar{\gamma}\cdot\pi_Q$, and $Im(\bar{\lambda})\subset\bar{\mathcal{M}}$, and $Im(T\bar{\lambda})\subset\bar{\mathcal{K}}$, then we have that

$$T\bar{\lambda}\cdot X_H\cdot\varepsilon=\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot X_h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}=X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}.$$

On the other hand, since $\varepsilon:T^*Q\to T^*Q$ is symplectic, and $\bar{\varepsilon}^*=\varepsilon^*\cdot\pi_{/G}^*:T^*(T^*Q)/G\to T^*T^*Q$ is also symplectic along $\bar{\varepsilon}$, then we have that

$$\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot T\bar{\varepsilon}\cdot X_{h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}}=\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot X_h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}=\frac{1}{I}\bar{\varepsilon}_3\partial_\theta=X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}.$$

Thus, $T\bar{\gamma}\cdot X_H^\varepsilon=X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}=T\bar{\lambda}\cdot X_H\cdot\varepsilon=\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot T\bar{\varepsilon}\cdot X_{h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}}$. In this case, we must have that ε and $\bar{\varepsilon}$ are the solution of the Type II of Hamilton-Jacobi equation $T\bar{\gamma}\cdot X_H^\varepsilon=X_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}$, for the nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian system $(\bar{\mathcal{K}},\omega_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}},h)$, if and only if they satisfy the equation $T\bar{\lambda}\cdot X_H\cdot\varepsilon=\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{K}}}\cdot T\bar{\varepsilon}\cdot X_{h\cdot\bar{\varepsilon}}$.

From the above discussion, we also see how the Hamilton-Jacobi equations for the nonholonomic reduced distributional Hamiltonian systems are simplified by nonholonomic reduction procedures. ■

It is well known that the theory of controlled mechanical systems became an important subject in recent years. Its research gathers together some separate areas of research such as mechanics, differential geometry and nonlinear control theory, etc., and the emphasis of this research on geometry is motivated by the aim of understanding the structure of equations of motion of the system, in a way that helps both for analysis and design. Thus, it is natural to study controlled mechanical systems by combining with the analysis of dynamic systems and the geometric reduction theory of Hamiltonian and Lagrangian systems. In particular, Marsden et al. in [31] set up the regular reduction theory of regular controlled Hamiltonian systems on a symplectic fiber bundle, by using momentum map and the associated reduced symplectic forms, and from the viewpoint of completeness of Marsden-Weinstein symplectic reduction, and some developments around the above work are given in Wang and Zhang [47], Ratiu and Wang [37], Van der Schaft and Wang [40], and Wang [42]. Since the Hamilton-Jacobi theory is developed based on the Hamiltonian picture of dynamics, it is natural idea to extend the Hamilton-Jacobi theory to the (regular) controlled Hamiltonian system and its a variety of reduced systems, and it is also possible to describe the relationship between the CH-equivalence for controlled Hamiltonian systems and the solutions of corresponding Hamilton-Jacobi equations, see Wang [44–46] for more details. Thus, our next topic is how to set up and develop the nonholonomic reduction and Hamilton-Jacobi theory for the nonholonomic controlled Hamiltonian systems and the distributional controlled Hamiltonian systems, by analyzing carefully the geometrical and topological structures of the phase spaces of these systems.

Acknowledgments: The authors would like to thank the partial support for the research work by Nankai University, 985 Project and the Key Laboratory of Pure Mathematics and Combinatorics, Ministry of Education, China, as well as by MINECO MTM 2013-42870-P, and the ICMAT Severo Ochoa project SEV-2011-0087, in Spain.

References

[1] Abraham R., Marsden J.E., Foundations of Mechanics, second ed., Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, (1978).

[2] Arnold V.I., Mathematical Methods of Classical Mechanics, second ed., in: Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 60, Springer-Verlag, (1989).

[3] Bates L. and Śniatycki J., Nonholonomic reduction, Rep. Math. Phys. 32, 99-115(1993).

[4] Bloch A.M., Nonholonomic Mechanics and Control, Interdisciplinary Mathematics Series, Vol 24, Springer-Verlag, New York, (2003).

[5] Bloch A.M., Krishnaprasad P.S., Marsden J.E. and Murray R.M., Nonholonomic mechanical systems with symmetry, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. 136, 21-99(1996).

[6] Cantrijn F., de León M., Marrero J.C. and Martin de Diego D., Reduction of nonholonomic mechanical system with symmetries, Rep. Math. Phys. 42(1/2), 25-45(1998).

[7] Cantrijn F., de León M., Marrero J.C. and Martin de Diego D., Reduction of constrained systems with symmetries, J. Math. Phys., 40(2), 795-820(1999).

[8] Cariñena J.F., Gràcia X., Marmo G., Martínez E., Muñoz-Lecanda M. and Román-Roy N., Geometric Hamilton-Jacobi theory, Int. J. Geom. Methods Mod. Phys. 3, 1417-1458(2006).

[9] Cariñena J.F., Gràcia X., Marmo G., Martínez E., Muñoz-Lecanda M. and Román-Roy N., Geometric Hamilton-Jacobi theory for nonholonomic dynamical systems, Int. J. Geom. Methods Mod. Phys. 7, 431-454(2010).

[10] Cendra H., Marsden J.E. and Ratiu T.S., Geometric mechanics, Lagrangian reduction and nonholonomic systems, In "Mathematics Unlimited 2001 and Beyond" (eds. B. Engquist and W. Schmid), Springer-Verlag, New York, 221-273(2001).

[11] Cushman R., Duistermaat H. and Śniatycki J., Geometry of Nonholonomic Constrained Systems, Advanced series in nonlinear dynamics, 26, (2010).

[12] Cushman R., Kemppainen D., Śniatycki J. and Bates L., Geometry of nonholonomic constraints, Rep. Math. Phys. 36(2/3), 275-286(1995).

[13] Ge Z. and Marsden J.E., Lie-Poisson integrators and Lie-Poisson Hamilton-Jacobi theory, Phys. Lett. A, 133, 134-139(1988).

[14] Gotay M.J. and Nester J.M., Presymplectic Lagrangian systems I: The constraint algorithm and the equivalence theorem, Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré, Sect. A, 30, 129-142(1979).

[15] Iglesias-Ponte D., de León M. and Martín de Diego D., Towards a Hamilton-Jacobi theory for nonholonomic mechanical systems, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 41, 1-14(2008).

[16] Jotz M. and Ratiu T.S., Dirac structures, Nonholonomic systems and reduction, Rep. Math. Phys., 69(1), 5-56(2012).

[17] Koiller J., Reduction of some classical non-holonomic systems with symmetry, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. 118, 113-148(1992).

[18] Koon W.S. and Marsden J.E., The Hamiltonian and Lagrangian approaches to the dynamics of nonholonomic systems, Rep. Math. Phys. 40, 21-62(1997).

[19] Koon W.S. and Marsden J.E., Poisson reduction of nonholonomic mechanical systems with symmetry, Rep. Math. Phys. 42(1/2), 101-134(1998).

[20] Lázaro-Camí J-A and Ortega J-P, The stochastic Hamilton-Jacobi equation, J. Geom. Mech. 1, 295-315(2009).

[21] de León M., Marrero J.C. and Martín de Diego D., A geometric Hamilton-Jacobi theory for classical field theories, In: Variations, Geometry and Physics, Nova Sci. Publ., New York, 129-140(2009).

[22] de León M., Marrero J.C. and Martín de Diego D., Linear almost Poisson structures and Hamilton-Jacobi equation, Applications to nonholonomic mechanics, J. Geom. Mech. 2, 159-198(2010).

[23] de León M. and Martín de Diego D., On the geometry of non-holonomic Lagrangian systems, Jour. Math. Phys., 37, 3389-3414(1996).

[24] de León M. and Rodrigues P.R., Methods of Differential Geometry in Analytical Mechanics, North-Holland, Amsterdam, (1989).

[25] de León M. and Wang H., Magnetic symplectic form and Hamilton-Jacobi equations for a Hamiltonian system with nonholonomic constraint, (2016).

[26] Libermann P. and Marle C.M., Symplectic Geometry and Analytical Mechanics, Kluwer Academic Publishers, (1987).

[27] Marsden J.E., Lectures on Mechanics, in: London Mathematical Society Lecture Notes Series, vol. 174, Cambridge University Press, (1992).

[28] Marsden J.E., Misiolek G., Ortega J.P., Perlmutter M. and Ratiu T.S., Hamiltonian Reduction by Stages, in: Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1913, Springer, (2007).

[29] Marsden J.E., Montgomery R. and Ratiu T.S., Reduction, Symmetry and Phases in Mechanics, in: Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society, vol. 88, American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island, (1990).

[30] Marsden J.E. and Ratiu T.S., Introduction to Mechanics and Symmetry, second ed., in: Texts in Applied Mathematics, vol. 17, Springer-Verlag, New York, (1999).

[31] Marsden J.E., Wang H. and Zhang Z.X., Regular reduction of controlled Hamiltonian system with symplectic structure and symmetry, Diff. Geom. Appl., 33(3), 13-45(2014), (arXiv: 1202.3564).

[32] Marsden J.E. and Weinstein A., Reduction of symplectic manifolds with symmetry, Rep. Math. Phys. 5, 121-130(1974).

[33] Marsden J.E. and West M., Discrete mechanics and variational integrators, Acta Numerica, 357-514(2001).

[34] Montgomery R., A Tour of Subriemannian Geometries, Their Geodesics and Applications, Math. Surveys and Monographs, Vol. 91, American Mathematical Society, Providence (2002).

[35] Ortega J-P and Ratiu T.S., Momentum Maps and Hamiltonian Reduction, in: Progress in Mathematics, vol. 222, Birkhäuser, (2004).

[36] Patrick G.W., Variational development of the semi-symplectic geometry of nonholonomic mechanics, Rep. Math. Phys. 59, 145-184(2007).

[37] Ratiu T.S. and Wang H., Poisson reduction of controlled Hamiltonian system by controllability distribution, (arXiv: 1312.7047).

[38] Śniatycki J., Nonholonomic Noether theorem and reduction of symmetries, Rep. Math. Phys. 42(1/2), 5-23(1998).

[39] Śniatycki J., Almost Poisson spaces and nonholonomic singular reduction, Rep. Math. Phys. 48(1/2), 235-248(2001).

[40] Van der Schaft A.J. and Wang H., Controlled implicit Hamiltonian and Lagrangian systems and their equivalences, (2014b).

[41] Vitagliano L., The Hamilton-Jacobi formalism for higher order field theories, Int. J. Geom. Methods Mod. Phys., 7(8), 1413-1436(2010).

[42] Wang H., Magnetic reduction of regular controlled Hamiltonian system with symmetry of the Heisenberg Group, (arXiv: 1506.03640).

[43] Wang H., Hamilton-Jacobi theorems for regular reducible Hamiltonian systems on a cotangent bundle, (arXiv: 1303.5840).

[44] Wang H., Hamilton-Jacobi theorems for regular controlled Hamiltonian system and its reductions, (arXiv: 1305.3457).

[45] Wang H., Symmetric reduction and Hamilton-Jacobi equation of rigid spacecraft with a rotor, J. Geom. Symm. Phys., 32, 87-111(2013), (arXiv: 1307.1606).

[46] Wang H., Symmetric reduction and Hamilton-Jacobi equation of underwater vehicle with internal rotors, (arXiv: 1310.3014).

[47] Wang H. and Zhang Z.X., Optimal reduction of controlled Hamiltonian system with Poisson structure and symmetry, Jour. Geom. Phys., 62 (5), 953-975(2012).

[48] Woodhouse N.M.J., Geometric Quantization, second ed., Clarendon Press, Oxford, (1992).